

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
COMP PLAN UPDATE
OCTOBER 2, 2003**

Depts of Elections & Auto Licensing
1408 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the Depts of Elections & Auto Licensing large conference room, 1408 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Vaughn Lein, Chair; Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair; Jada Rupley, Dick Deleissegues, Lonnie Moss, and Ron Barca.

Members Absent: Carey Smith.

Staff Present: Patrick Lee, Long Range Manager; Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Manager; Evan Dust, Program Manager II; Derek Chisholm, Planner II; Colete Anderson, Planner II; Sandra Towne, Planner III; Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner; Jose Alvarez, Planner II, and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for October 2, 2003

The agenda for October 2, 2003, was approved as distributed.

B. Communications from the Public

LEIN: This is a continuation of the hearing from last Thursday. Is there any additional information on tonight's agenda other than continuation?

LEE: No. You've received some additional comments that have come in the last week which we've provided to you.

LEIN: We thank you for all of these additional comments too. With that in mind we'll open it to communications from the public. Anyone wishing to come forward before the Planning Commission on items other than what is on tonight's public hearing agenda, we ask that you step forward to the microphone and state your name and address for the record.

AUDIENCE: Where's the microphone?

LEIN: It's up here. Now is this something that is related to tonight's hearing?

AUDIENCE: I don't know.

LEIN: Are you looking at a specific piece of property?

AUDIENCE: Yes.

LEIN: Okay, that will be on tonight's hearing agenda. Okay.

AUDIENCE: And I'm just a private citizen not representing anyone.

LEIN: Okay, we will get to you for that in a little bit. Okay. Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

UPDATE OF CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, continued from September 25, 2003:

PLEASE NOTE: Testimony will be taken from property owners on requested changes in land use designations.

Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Plan. As part of this effort, the Clark County Planning Commission will be holding a hearing to take testimony on, and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding update to the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. At this hearing, the following will be considered:

Proposed changes to the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan text and policies contained within.

Proposed Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps for unincorporated rural and resource lands, and maps establishing expanded Urban Growth Area boundaries and providing plan designations for unincorporated lands within such boundaries for each of the following cities in Clark County: Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal, and Yacolt.

Implementation Measures - Proposed zoning ordinances and other measures necessary to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Capital Facilities Plans and supporting documents.

A Final EIS issued on the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for Clark County and cities within the county.

Staff Contacts: Patrick Lee, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4112 or Bob Higbie, 397-2375, Ext. 4113.

LEIN: This is a continuation from last Thursday. We went through the City testimony and apologize we got a little bit late at 11:00 so we continued it to tonight. Our intent here is to work till about 6:10, 6:15, take about a 15-minute break and come back at 6:30. We see that many of the people here on the sign-up sheet are very professional, we ask that instead of getting up and reading large amounts of testimony, you summarize your comments to us if at all possible so that we can continue on with as many people as we can.

If we don't get done between now and 6:15 with the initial groups of organizations and individuals that didn't have an opportunity to testify last week, we'll continue that at 6:30 and we will then continue on when that's done on the private individuals. We plan on breaking about 10:00 tonight so be prepared. We don't know sometimes how long the testimony is going to occur and we apologize for that. If you get to a point where you need to go home, I'm sure that there will be opportunity in future hearings to have that. So with that I'll turn it over to Mr. Lee.

LEE: We weren't going to present any additional staff report at this time. When we begin the review of the site-specific requests that we have, we'll provide a brief staff report at that time.

LEIN: Thank you. Then we'll continue down the line of names from last week.

DELEISSEGUES: Vaughn.

LEIN: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Before we go past that I've got a question on the material that staff sent out. Where it says "the proposed zone" on these charts and then it says "zone request" up at the top.

LEE: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Is that no change, for example, from the zone request or no change from the existing zone?

LEE: That is the no change from the request. So, for example, if someone requested a certain change and it was not included in the proposed, it would read "no change."

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: All right. Any other questions before we start? Mr. Karpinski.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

KARPINSKI: Ready?

LEIN: Yes.

KARPINSKI: Okay, my name is John Karpinski, K-a-r-p-i-n-s-k-i, here presenting testimony on behalf of Clark County Natural Resources Council. I've been told by staff that you received a copy of the letter that was jointly drafted between us and Friends of Clark County. I'm going to just summarize what I consider some of the more major points of what's going on and I will not try to read or repeat that testimony.

We're back again on round two of growth management in Clark County. It seems to me that round one has been an admitted failure by almost all parties involved and what I'm seeing here today is a kinder and gentler version of the same failed policies we had before. There's some good things about it. We're using more accurate numbers. We're getting more realistic in terms of what we're actually doing to grow. But some of the same problems we had in 1994 we still have. And as a matter of fact they're worse. I'll talk more specifics regarding capital facilities in the capital facilities segment, but you can't talk about what's wrong with the plan without at least mentioning capital facilities. And what I see here is a lot of denial in this plan. There's -- the big picture, there's a lot of things that the County just doesn't want to deal with.

The first issue that I see a lot of denial on is the availability of money. Any time any organization undertakes anything one of the first things they should look at is how much money do we got and it's been very difficult to get that information out of the County. What I have been able to determine, and funny it didn't show up in the EIS, that there is a billion dollar road deficit in the State system over 20 years. That's \$1 billion. You know the old saying, a billion dollars here, a billion dollars there, pretty soon you got real money. Now what does the -- and it's really funny how with this huge deficit the amount that the revenues needed and basically the State system needs \$1.2 billion worth of money and it only has \$200 million reasonably funded so there's the billion dollar short. It's funny that that's not in the EIS, you would think it would need to be there. But what they did is in the FEIS my response to how can -- last time you got guys got remanded because you had a \$200 million deficit, now you have a billion dollar deficit, how can you do that. According to the comment, response to comments in the FEIS, while the funding shortfalls that you predicted may be evident in the State system, such a catastrophe does not appear likely on the County system. I'm sure that's going to make everybody feel really warm and fuzzy regarding the state of their roads after this road proposal. So in terms of availability of

money, you got a billion dollar State shortfall, we need 30 new schools under this State plan, where's the money going to come from the 30 new schools. So I think there's some denial regarding the availability of money.

Next is the availability infrastructure, again roads. Look at the map up there, I got it blown up as big as I could at J2, this is the final document or the next to the last document in the draft EIS, what that is what are our roads going to look like in 2023. Now this is after we spend a half a billion dollars to upgrade our roads and there's still more red ink up there than an Enron spreadsheet, so we're in a lot of denial regarding roads. We're in some denial regarding water and I'll talk about that more at the capital facilities hearing. I think we're in denial on jobs. Now how many major employers have ever moved to an area saying we moved here because the roads are really bad. If you read the final EIS at Page 93, the road problems, what you see on the map up there, will have a significant negative effect on freight mobility. How many major employers don't need either to move products or people to and from their businesses. I think we're in denial that we can ignore this road problem and think we're going to have jobs in this county.

Now one of the big things we've talked about is the jobs to houses ratio, we need to improve our jobs to houses ratio. Our '94 plan said we would improve our jobs to houses ratio and it didn't happen, not because we didn't get enough jobs, I think we did as good of a job here as we can to get new jobs, it's not just painting colors on a map and the jobs miraculously spring up, but the problem is that we just got too many new houses and we just simply can't keep up, and I'll talk more on population, but I don't think we're going to improve our job situation by adding substantial amounts of new population. I think we're in denial by thinking we can color something on a map and the jobs will spring up. The, you know, if you zone it, they will come Field of Dreams approach to economic development. There's no sort of needs analysis, supply analysis, capacity analysis, we're just hoping jobs will come up by painting colors on a map, I think we need to do more than that. We need to have a strong no net loss of industrial lands policy. Again, the County got a remand because it's ironic that the people who are pushing the most for fiscal conservatism and protection of jobs in the community are, is CCNRC on this issue, but we're the ones that appealed saying, hey, the minute you hand this to the City they'll rezone it for houses and there go all your jobs and what are you going to do about it.

Now in the County there's a no net loss policy, we think that should be retained. We don't think it should be changed to a no net loss of jobs because what happens then you have your industrial jobs which are your family wage jobs at about 9 units an acre, you have your commercial jobs, which are your mixed jobs, at about 20 units an acre, so if you switch this no net loss to just a total number of jobs, you can be trading family wage jobs for Mic jobs. And so you could rezone an industrial parcel half to commercial and say you've actually added jobs, but those are not the kind of jobs you want in a community. So the no net loss policy has to apply to family wage jobs, and whether that's acreage or population, but if it doesn't apply to family wage jobs we're not doing our job.

We're in denial regarding Battle Ground suitability. You know, a large lion share of the growth in this place is going -- in this plan is going to Battle Ground which historically in our opinion has been the jurisdiction least capable of handling the growth. There's a lot of problems with expanding this big in Battle Ground. According to the FEIS this is the most expensive place to grow, then why are we going there. If we're in a fiscally constrained environment, why are we building in the most expensive place to build. It has water problems. The FEIS at Page 116 says that Battle Ground has short-term water problems. Battle Ground has historically had a lot of infrastructure problems, including water problems. There's a real salmon problem regarding the CPU water wells and their withdrawals from hydrologically connected wells to the Salmon Creek watershed, there's some water problems there. The road problems. Look on that map, look where the red is, this is in the EIS, one could waggishly say that all failing roads lead to Battle Ground. This is -- they don't have the roads and know that we're dumbing down the plan to give -- in terms of densities by giving Battle Ground the additional, the additional acreage.

We had a goal -- we used to have a goal of 8 dwelling, you know, units an acre, now it's down to 7, and because we gave Battle Ground so much land and they're at of course 6 instead of 8 for Vancouver, we've now dumbing down the plan from 7 to 6.8. That's at Page 28 of the FEIS. Battle Ground has awful critical areas ordinances, their park standards is 5 per thousand compared to Vancouver's 12 per thousand so they have 59 percent less parks than Vancouver. The impervious surface, just adding for the East Fork alone the National Marine Fishery Service says we're not supposed to have more than 10 percent impervious surface in a watershed, here just the expansion for Battle Ground alone adds 3.2 percent total impervious surface for the East Fork. That's FEIS at Page 41. What kind -- well, what are we getting for this all this growth in Battle Ground, you know, are we getting the failing roads, what are we getting. We're getting mixed use residential which is 95 percent residential, which to me, in my mind, really isn't mixed use, and we're getting mixed use employment where the FEIS says the people who work there won't be able to afford to live there. That's the Final Environmental Impact Statement at 78.

I think the plan is in denial in regard to quality of life, for road congestion, safety, schools, the environment and jobs. It's certainly in denial and compliance with the Growth Management Act. If a \$200 million deficit is illegal, a billion dollar deficit is certainly illegal. There's been a remand before on the jobs no net loss policy, you still have some problems with real versus projected numbers, you have a major consistency problem. I can't see how you can say that we want to grow at the 1.83 population figure when we don't have the money to support it. I think it's a huge problem with consistency in your capital facilities plan which require to line up. Your FEIS has a lot of problems, I won't get into that now. And it's, you know, all the cases talk about when you're expanding an urban growth boundary, you're supposed to make an effort to avoid resource land and I don't see that that was even a criteria here. You know, there's criteria found in all the cases of how and where you expand the boundaries, none of those criteria were followed here.

So that's the problems at least the way we see it. We don't want to come to you with just

problems, we do want to come to you with a solution. We believe the solution is adoption of Alternative 3 to the FEIS which is a no expansion of the urban growth boundary. Also we think we should look at the population figures. We don't think there should be more than a 1.5 percent. And frankly, given our fiscally constrained policies we think perhaps even a 1.0, the lowest possible growth rate, is probably even more than we can afford, but I think at some point in time when you don't have the money, you do the least that you can.

Now Alternative 3 can support the population of the preferred alternative. As a matter of fact the FEIS in Volume II says you can fit even the 1.83 within the existing boundaries and have a 13 percent access, so therefore there's no reason to expand the urban growth boundaries, period. And I would go on to say that in that case I believe it is illegal to expand the urban growth boundary, period. In terms of jobs, I think we can have all the jobs this community can support inside the existing boundaries. First of all, the preferred alternative doesn't use real numbers. The real jobs per acre they have they use 9 jobs per acre for industrial where the real numbers are 13, they use 20 jobs an acre instead of 29 for the office park. I think if you use the real numbers, you know, what's actually been going on for the last 5 or 10 years, there will be plenty of room for jobs.

Also, one of the things the FEIS doesn't do and the vacant buildable lands analysis doesn't do is look at the vacancy rate of existing buildings. According to the Columbian, and I read it in the Columbian so it's got to be true, there's a vacancy rate of 20 percent for all existing commercial and industrial buildings, okay. Now what are we doing with those buildings. Essentially the County's growth plan assumes those buildings will remain vacant for the next 20 years because they're not factored in the numbers at all. So we think that you can accommodate a lot of growth through just filling in existing buildings. If you want the best example of that, and this is at Page 22 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, is that 40 percent of Vancouver jobs from 1996 to 1999 has been in redevelopment, been on developing existing areas. We don't need new areas for people. We don't need new areas for jobs. Obviously the no expansion alternative is the most fiscally conservative option. It's really funny that the guy with the ponytail has to stand up here and talk about saving money when all the conservatives are out saying we should expand the urban growth boundary as fast as the taxpayers can print the money, but that seems to be how the growth process works. We think Alternative 3 provides more efficient services, certainly has less environmental impacts, you're not talking about adding 20 miles of salmon bearing stream and all that impervious surface into the urban growth boundaries and it's more sustainable.

Now there's a word you don't really hear when we talk about Clark County's growth planning is the whole concept is sustainability, do we have the water, do we have the land, you know. There was a study done by the City of Vancouver that said if we keep going at the existing rate we'll be -- we'll build out to the East Fork by 2040 and we'll build out the non-mountainous part of the county by 2060, where are our grandkids going to live, you know. I think we need to start looking at the concept of sustainability and one of the best ways of doing that is trying to live within both our economic and our land means right now,

which is Alternative 3.

In regard to the testimony provided by the Cities, it's really ironic that the city that in my opinion has done the best job of managing growth, which is Vancouver, has said we don't want all this land that you're giving us because we know we can't handle it because we have experience in this stuff and we don't need it and we can't handle it, whereas the City that has the least amount of success in dealing with growth, which is Battle Ground, is saying, yeah, bring it on, you know. I support the fact that Vancouver is saying that there is no documented need for the expansion the County is trying to foist upon them. It's going to be interesting to try to explain to the Growth Board why we need to expand more than the City is asking for, you know, almost triple what the City is asking for in this case.

So obviously this has a lot of problems. We think Alternative 3 is the best solution. I think a quick look at what our quality of life is going to be if we adopt the preferred alternative, as well as all the legal and economic reasons think that should be what we should be doing. That's it. Thank you very much.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Karpinski? Thank you, John.

KARPINSKI: Thank you.

LEIN: Gretchen Starke.

STARKE: My name is Gretchen Starke, and that's S-t-a-r-k-e, and I live at 308 NE 124th Avenue. I am the conservation chair of the Vancouver Audubon Society and am speaking on Audubon's behalf. The Vancouver Audubon Society promotes the conservation of birds and other wildlife and this is our priority and so in order to have wildlife we need to have habitat and so this is going to be the emphasis of my testimony. Although I am going to get into the population numbers because as population grows this has a direct impact on fish and wildlife. The growth that we had during the past decade was too much too fast. Anybody who drives East Mill Plain knows that. To keep up that rate of growth would destroy this country as -- this county as a desirable place to live, but we still think that the 1.83 percent growth rate is too high.

Now one problem with getting a handle on it in your mind is people don't understand geometric rate of growth, geometric progression, as you grow, your base grows and so it's not a straight line. So one way of looking at what a rate of growth looks like is to look at the doubling time, how many years would it take to double the population at a growth rate of 1.83 percent, and assuming that this kept on indefinitely it would be 37.8 percent or 37.8 years which is better than Third World country rate of growth. For the 20-year period that is being analyzed the increase in population is the FEIS said it would be more than 30 percent. This projected increase of population would put a great strain on the County's resources and on the public services, and frankly I think if the public as a whole understood what was going on, they would not support this at all. The builders and the developers

think that the 1.83 percent growth rate is too low. They've mentioned a 3 percent growth rate. Just to give you an idea 3 percent is less than twice as much as 1.8, but the doubling time for that is about 23 years and that is Third World rate of growth. So the builders and the developers are being totally unrealistic unless their primary concern is just making a lot of money and getting out and I imagine there's some of them that do.

Except for the no action alternative which we supported in our comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the growth boundary areas are less than any of the other alternatives looked at. However, the projected population piece has been increased from the 1.5 percent which was in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and for the reasons I stated above we think that increasing this is a mistake. 1.5 percent would be a doubling time of 46 years and that, that gives you a little bit more breathing room than the 1.83 percent. Projecting this lower population growth would lead to policies that could possibly actually in reality decrease the runaway growth that we've been experiencing; that is, if we plan for a lesser amount of growth and then institute policies such, that is there, you know, there is if you build the houses and the developers promote them the people will come, and if you don't build the houses you won't maybe have people moving from California to settle in Clark County. Maybe not as many anyway.

Increasing urban density while preserving more or less the rural areas of the county has both good and bad effects on wildlife. The good is that less land and less habitat will be affected by the growth. This is assuming that we don't have wall to wall 5-acre subdivisions all over the county as a subdivision of 5 acres apiece still impacts habitat although not as much as your really dense urban development. The bad effect is that all habitat within urban growth boundaries could be trashed and they will be trashed if there are not sufficient mitigation measures, and for this reason the mitigation of adverse effects on wildlife habitat become extremely important, particularly in the -- or within the urban growth area. And then we know that the County was updating the critical areas plans and we will be very interested in the effectiveness of such an ordinance. At the moment it isn't very.

In fact in looking at the Final Environmental Impact Statement and I was, I was disappointed. I was under the impression that the consideration of wildlife both in analyzing the effects of the alternatives and in analyzing the mitigation measures was given only the amount of attention absolutely required by law. And maybe not even that much. There appears to be little or no effort to do anything extra. For the mitigation measures there's a great deal of dependence on future actions and that is the updates of the critical areas ordinances and the shorelines management plan. If these are good, fine; if these are bad, we've lost the wildlife habitat. There is -- the reliance on Federal measures is overly optimistic, particularly in light of current political realities on the national level. And contrary to the responses of Audubon's comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement under the State Environmental Policy Act the effectiveness -- the proposed mitigation measures do need to be assessed. I will say that I was, was good to see an honest statement in the final impact statement which said that there would be

losses and it's true that there will be.

On the specific areas to be added to the urban growth areas we have a problem with giving Fisher Swale to either Camas or Vancouver, I've mentioned this before, but this at one time was prime habitat, it's been fragmented and hit over the past decade, but there is, there's still wetlands there, there's still areas that should be treated more gently than put in an urban, totally urban setting. We now in addition to the Fisher Swale I mentioned Battle Ground. Battle Ground overreaches. You have the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed alternatives pulls back from the desires, the original desires of Battle Ground fortunately, pull back from the Lewis River, still takes in too much of the Salmon Creek area.

And then I'm only going to say I have a problem with the process. I'll just put this for the record sake, the public would have an easier time of analyzing this if there were I will say preferred alternative available in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We had such a short time in looking at the final with the, well, practically brand-new alternative to deal with. It was kind of a combination of things, but it was still practically, so it would have -- it would have been better had there been a preferred alternative identified at the outset. Of course this doesn't mean that there couldn't have been modifications between the draft and the final, but -- and those, the Final Environmental Impact Statement, you know, you've got it yourself.

So in summary, the projected population growth increase is too high. Too little attention is paid to fish and wildlife habitat and the proposed mitigation measures are inadequate or uncertain. In general we approve of the smaller urban growth boundaries with the exceptions that I noted previously. And I will be -- am intending to send in some more detailed comments on the Final Environmental Impact Statement at some -- in the very near future and I assume the comment there will be an opportunity to send in up until the time you are ready to make your final decision. Thank you very much.

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Starke? Thank you. Todd Horenstein. Not here. John McKibbin. Thom McConathy.

MCCONATHY: This plan sustains and accommodates growth of the urban --

LEIN: Excuse me, Thom, could you state your name and address for the record, please.

MCCONATHY: Okay, I thought that since you had called me you had my sign-in.

LEIN: She won't have your address though.

MCCONATHY: Okay. This is Thom McConathy of 1017 NE 107th Street, Vancouver, Washington 98685.

LEIN: Thank you.

MCCONATHY: This plan sustains and accommodates growth of the UGAs. The County wants these areas due to the revenues from urban development and the Cities like this as they receive the synergetic economic benefits of larger populations without the expenses of offering the urban quality of infrastructure. The ones that are hurt by these are -- these practices are those that are forced to live in this limbo. These areas have the density without the funding of the mitigating parks and other important urban mitigating factors. This disparity that leaves citizens the victims of self-serving governments was supposed to be one of the factors that spawned the Growth Management Act in the first place. These issues could be partly mitigated with a commitment to a systematic annexation of the UGA and strong interlocal commitments obligating the Cities to the responsibility for planning and meeting the infrastructure needs of development to urban standards.

It shocked me to hear, or finally hear, Vancouver not wanting the County offered expansion of the urban growth boundary and wanting these to be placed in an urban reserve. The cost of annexation and the bringing up to standard of urban areas that have been built with no real planning is much more expensive than Vancouver senior long-range planner stated as it also includes many factors of which are not part of the County's present planning process, if you can call it that. The County in this plan fails to commit itself to systematic watershed planning as was proposed in the last round of growth management. The 30-year-old floodplain ordinance and shoreline master programs still need revision, but a lot more than the mitigating standard of updating a few maps. There is no septic tank conversion plan for the unincorporated Clark County for within the -- or within the urban growth areas. Septic tanks have been identified from as early as 1960s as a significant source of ground and surface water contamination. These systems were never developed as long-term solutions and are an anathema to nearby streams within the urban growth boundaries.

In my testimony on the draft EIS and alternatives I pointed out that there is no groundwater management in Clark County and that the wellhead and aquifer protection that occur are only in relation to municipal wells and that a significant portion of the population in Clark County are still dependent upon private wells and that they have both quality and quantity issues. No attempt to assess the quantity or qualify, the extent of this problem, has been done by Clark County. This is supposed to be a 20 year plan, but this plan only identifies municipal quantities for water in some cases five years out. Parks and open space are vital elements of mitigation for increased densities. To freeze this element as is proposed in this plan shows that this county is not supporting or sustaining our current quality of life standards. Adopting this standard will only result in a meaner, nastier Clark County in the future. The open space program must grow if we are to protect watersheds in sensitive areas, especially if we are to avoid potential taking issues with lands that cannot be developed. The County must commit to becoming a sewerage provider if we are to sustain large urban growth boundaries where urban densities are to be allowed. To do so has and will continue to result in ground and surface water pollution. Current

stormwater and erosion control ordinances are not sufficient to stop the surface water degradation.

Current ordinances are not compliant with current best available science or the 1990 or even the current Puget Sound manuals. Minimum 200-foot buffers are being used by most of Portland metro counties, yet this same stream in Clark County receives a poultry 25-foot buffer that can be averaged down to 40 percent of that. Page 41, Line 5, of the plan writes off Salmon Creek as being a stabilized in a degraded state. This is not acceptable as no special protection is recommended due to this evaluation. This is not acceptable. Line 15 also of Page 41 says that Whipple Creek should be protected due to its being a tributary of the East Fork. This is an extreme problem with geography. And it has high fishery values due to its connection with East Fork. This is interesting, it is entertaining, but it is fiction, but I still think Whipple Creek should receive some degree of protection and this plan gives it none. Line 20, Page 20, some management of withdrawals need to be done due to the (inaudible) down of surface waters in the critical summer months to support fishery and recreational needs on almost all the creeks and tributaries in Clark County. Line 30, Page 42, many of the described problems are being resolved in other western jurisdictions and metro counties just across the Columbia River by 200-foot buffers.

Line 35, Page 40, 40, on groundwater, the proposal of case-by-case assessment of quantity issues for assessment of surface water and quantity issues by the Health Department who has no qualifications in this regard and this is supposed to be doing, being done now and it is not solving the problems now, but continuing this with still no objective criteria is not going to mitigate or solve this problem. Private wells will continue to be affected by the growth of which is projected by this, this is not solving the problem. Page 45, wellhead protection, this is not a groundwater management plan, this is not proactive and at best is only reactive at a time too late to do anything but close down the well. This stance ignores the many private wells serving the 16,000 people or rural in rural Clark County and an estimated 30,000 more that now live within the UGAs. This is more than the population of the city of Vancouver just 10 years ago and it is not protected by this plan. There is no groundwater protection in here. This needs to be tied to the issuance of septic tank permits. Those two need to be keyed together and they are not done, there is no effort to do so in this plan.

Page 46, mitigation of groundwater. It matters not whether a septic tank is working perfectly or totally incapacitated with regard to nitrate issues. The best working septic system removes very little nitrates out of the outflow. These systems remove phosphates rather well when the drain fields are anaerobic and filled with plants that fix this nutrient in a form not rendered free again when winter rain saturates ground and make these fields anaerobic and thus free to flow into streams and groundwater. With this in mind current septic tank inspection programs are mostly useless.

Page 55, airport noise. This important issue is not considered by this plan. We have airports in Clark County that we have and we're exposed to a lot of noise from PDX. There

is a need in the county to protect people and to ensure the future viability of this expanding and important, arguably important industry. PDX is supposed to double its number of flights by 2010. If these flights -- if more than half of these flights take off over Clark County, it behooves Clark County to be involved in this planning process. Clark County landowners and schools are eligible for mitigation by ways of noise insulation retrofits if the County pushes for this through the current 501 process and they're not. Clark County needs also to consider the air noise overlay that has been urged upon it by the FAA.

Page 113, sanitary sewers. Septic tanks are one of the most significant contributors to ground and surface water pollution in Clark County. This is not a new finding. Mundorf in 1962 groundwater assessment of Clark County said the same thing. We have in excess of 50,000 in the unincorporated Clark County and are still increasing this about by 500 a year.

Clark County is not a sewerage provider and does not have a systematic or comprehensive plan to convert these temporary systems to sewers and thus address this larger and significant issue. These systems are contributing a lot to the degradation of our ground and surface water. Page 30 or Line, Page 113, Line 30, septic tank conversion within the UGAs. There is no plan to systematically or comprehensively reduce these systems within the UGAs. This issue must be addressed through interlocal agreements, regulations and some jurisdictions offering sewers. As these standards now this is only a commitment to further degrade ground and surface water. If this is enacted without such a plan, this is going to be a very much nastier Clark County.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. McConathy?

DELEISSEGUES: No.

LEIN: Thank you. Art Stubbs.

STUBBS: I'm deferring to Doug Ballou.

BALLOU: Good evening. My name is Doug Ballou. My address is 3109 NE 96th Street, Vancouver. I'm chairman of the Neighborhood Associations Council of Clark County and here to represent their comments. I turned in my letter I sent in a week ago to you and I'm passing that around here and I'll just go through that. The Neighborhood Associations Council of Clark County, what we refer to as NACCC, representing 35 county neighborhood associations plays an important role as a communication link between neighborhood associations and County government regarding issues that impact the livability of Clark County. NACCC also works to improve meaningful citizen involvement, among other issues the land use planning process, including zoning changes, policy and regulation changes and long-term community planning. Over the past three years NACCC and county neighborhood associations have been active participants in providing input into the update of the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. We appreciate this opportunity this evening to provide further comment regarding the latest release of the plan.

The proposed growth management plan documents were not made available to the public for review until September 18th, one week prior to this Planning Commission hearing which was extended another week to tonight. With such a short review time frame it's difficult to provide meaningful comment until a thorough review can be completed. There have been some major sections added to the plan which were absent in the draft plan made available for concurrent review with the DEIS back in April of this year; therefore we request that the Planning Commission recommend to the County Commissioners that a 90-day review period be established to allow sufficient time for meaningful public review and comment on the proposed comprehensive plan.

Our comments that follow reflect only what we noted based on a cursory review of the plan and our ongoing involvement over this past three years in this planning process. Overall let me say the plan and this process have been an improvement over the prior planning and process. The proposed plan is much better than any of the four alternatives, alternative expansion plans that were first under consideration, and the plan reflects the need to provide more areas for jobs and additional growth. Also, staff has addressed some of the adverse zoning impacts on existing and residential neighborhoods, but there is still no specific mention of transitional development from industrial to commercial and then residential, thus minimizing the potential of incompatible development next to each other. Although the plan is very much improved over prior plans there's still much more room for improvement and hopefully some of these changes can be addressed prior to final approval of the plan.

Overall the plan is inadequately defined and incomplete in some areas. For example, one of the incomplete areas of the plan is in the industrial land use designation which does not distinguish between light and heavy industrial uses as the prior plan did. "Industrial" includes numerous land uses some of which could have significant negative impacts on safety, neighborhood livability, quality of life and property values if developed near an established residential neighborhood. Sufficient flexibility needs to be built into the development review and approval process to mitigate impacts that degrade adjacent residential properties. NACCC also recommends that subarea plans be established for specific areas that have common identities such as commercial, residential centers, industrial areas and large contiguous neighborhoods in incorporated Clark County but within the urban growth boundaries. Some of this work has been done but only on a limited basis. These plans should be developed based on input from key stakeholders of that area. Also, all areas added due to expansion of the existing urban growth boundary should be brought in as urban holding and not allowed to develop until subarea plans are developed and required infrastructure is planned for and, key point here, funded as a condition of approval. If the County cannot provide some of the funding for infrastructure it would then be the responsibility of the developer as a condition of approval.

A key theme of the proposed comprehensive plan should be to accommodate future growth in a way that maintains and enhance community quality of life. This should be a

primary goal of the plan and continue to guide future decisions on the final plan. The proposed comprehensive plan needs to do more to protect the property rights of existing homeowners and preserve neighborhood livability and quality of life is required by the GMA. The proposed map should include land designations and urban growth boundary lines which conform to the following principles: New residential developments need to be compatible with existing established neighborhoods, not widely divergent. Commercial and industrial development should be located along existing or more readily expanded transportation corridors consistent with planned and funded road improvements. No major development should be planned where a logical necessary access is on roads not in the current transportation improvement plans. The new tran -- the transition to new land use designation should be gradual and not abrupt. Planned land use change designations needs to incorporate a gradient land use change progression on the order of low density urban residential, medium density urban residential, high density urban residential, mixed use, office and business park, commercial, light industrial, heavy industrial.

The proposed draft mixed use employment center and urban holding districts code have been carefully reviewed. We are pleased with these proposed code additions but are concerned that mixed uses districts as they develop may allow concentration of specific uses rather than the integration of residential and commercial development as intended in the Code. At this time we have no suggested changes that might tighten the Code to assure better integration of these -- of the uses on the site. Also, language needs to be added to these codes which preserves the existing neighborhood quality of life adjoining mixed use development and employment centers. Okay.

With regard to transportation in the proposed comprehensive plan, upon review of the maps it is apparent that traffic congestion will continue to worsen over the next 20 years with a projected plan or projected planned substantial degradation by 2023. To mitigate this in the plan Clark County needs to do a better job of directing growth to better utilize the existing infrastructure, especially our freeways. To do that we need to create more jobs on this side of the Columbia River as we all agree. The continued battle between Clark County and the cities over where those jobs will be created is counterproductive. A mutually acceptable tax revenue sharing agreement should be made such that everyone benefits from job growth in Clark County even if it is in unincorporated Clark County. New commercial centers and large industrial developments providing needed family wage jobs should be adjacent to our existing freeways and major arterials rather than next to existing residential neighborhoods served by unimproved County roads where significant road improvements are required to service new industry and commercial centers.

In addition to these recommended changes, our organization recommends to Clark County that you create a design and architectural standards ordinance and an architectural review committee. First, regarding the design and architectural standards, we recommend that the proposed comprehensive plan include a new ordinance for commercial design and architectural standards. There are many examples of commercial areas which are in need of revitalization that can benefit from this requirement. Attractive commercial community

centers will promote job growth in our community by attracting new business. Investors are likely -- are less likely to risk capital investment in areas of blight and commercial decline such as what has happened along Highway 99, the strip in Hazel Dell. Clark County government with input from various stakeholders should create and implement new guidelines designed to encourage new development, renovation of existing structures and infrastructure improvements. To achieve a goal of progressive growth Clark County needs to use its authority to develop and then enforce new codes and standards for architectural design. These basic architectural standards will remove a major barrier to redevelopment. Developers will also benefit and be more likely to come to Clark County if they knew what was required of them and not have to be concerned about negotiating with County planning staff to come up with a workable plan.

Moving on to the architectural review committee, in conjunction with the development of new architectural design standards we recommend the creation of an architectural review committee and include this as an element of the proposed comprehensive plan. As a step to improve the business climate and sense of place, Clark County should establish an architectural review committee to encourage and promote development that is harmonious with the surrounding area as it exists. The ARC should be composed of citizens with expertise and/or invest in design and architect, with interest, excuse me, in design and architect, and certainly would include representatives from the development community and other interested parties. The architectural review committee would review all aspects of a proposed project that deal with the outside appearance. Some of these might include access, on-site circulation, grading, tree impacts and building placement. The committee could also analyze landscape areas and planting, architectural style, bulk, mass, and color to make sure that they conform with adopted guidelines. Projects need to demonstrate conformance with all applicable zoning code standards before architectural review. Many cities, towns and communities and counties across the nation have created these types of committees that review projects for appearance and style and now is the time for Clark County to take that step. The proposed comprehensive plan needs some flexibility. If something in the final adopted plan is not working and we know it, then the necessary changes need to be made now and not wait until the next plan update. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the plan.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Ballou? Thank you. Bud Van Cleve.

VAN CLEVE: I'll pass. My comments have already been covered.

LEIN: Thank you. Denise Stiffarm. Todd Johnson.

JOHNSON: This is for the record and this is for each one of them.

LEIN: We will be taking a break after this testimony when it's done, we'll reconvene at 6:30. At the present rate I figure we're going to go somewhere between 9 and 13 hours of testimony so we will not hear everybody this evening. We will try to make a cutoff time so

that everybody won't have to stand around the rest of the night.

HOWSLEY: I guess I'll go ahead and wait while Todd's entering that. My name is James Howsley, I'm an attorney with Lane, Powell, Spears, Lubersky. My address is 601 SW Second Avenue, Suite 2100, Portland, Oregon 97204. I'm here on behalf of the consortium of clients that I'll be representing later on tonight as well as on behalf of my law firm. With me is Todd Johnson with Olson Engineering. Todd is here to assist me if the Planning Commission has any questions. I would first like to apologize to the Planning Commission in advance that you'll be seeing a lot of me tonight due to the site-specific requests that do come up later. You have with you a copy of a letter, I'm not sure if it was submitted into the record or not yet, basically detailing our concerns that we have with the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the preferred alternative, and I'll keep this very brief tonight because I think the letter is pretty self-explanatory. I just want to highlight some issues and have the ability to answer any questions that you may have regarding the studies that we conducted.

The first issue that we have a concern with is the adopted infrastructure deduction. Prior in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement the infrastructure deduction going along was 38 percent, during the Board's deliberations on June 24th of this year they adopted a 27.5 percent infrastructure deduction on residential lands. In looking back through the record we believe that part of the reason for this adoption was based upon a study that the City of Vancouver had conducted sometime back, and without having ample time to basically review that study prior to the adoption of that number by the Board we weren't able to get our comments in the record so this is where we're doing it. Reflecting upon what the clients that we represented over the years on projects we believe that the 27.5 percent is too low knowing what's out there so we had Olson Engineering and through the County GIS basically conduct a study over the same area that the City had done.

Just to highlight a few things, the City exhibit showed a six-square mile area although their data appeared to show a four-square mile area. The findings of the study that we conducted seemed to indicate that infrastructure on residential land should be 38 percent. We noticed a couple of troubling areas in the City's findings. One, that they counted underutilized and vacant lands in their study. Secondly, they tended to group the land use -- all the land use types together, that was industrial, commercial and residential, rather than distinguishing them by land use type which is required under the County's comprehensive plan. We also noticed that they didn't really account for schools and parks and churches and those other uses that tend to come out of residential lands more than the other land use types. We then conducted that same -- using that same model conducted the same study over the entire Vancouver UGA and came up with a much larger number. Partly that was due, obviously, to the fact that there's more freeways out there, there's some large institutional things like Washington State in Clark County that have an impact upon that. Basically we're recommending we would like the Planning Commission to recommend to the Board to readopt the 38 percent infrastructure deduction based upon the findings that we've provided the Planning Commission.

Some of the other concerns that we have highlighted in the letter I'm not going to spend a lot of time on because they're pretty self-explanatory; however, there is one issue that we'd also like to address and that was the issue of private covenants. Several of the expansion areas proposed for residential development, especially in the Vancouver UGA, have private covenants prohibiting further subdivision. We took a small sampling of that and in an attachment to this you can see our findings. While most of the covenants -- in some of the covenants they did allow for subdivision but only upon majority approval of the property owners within that subdivision. So while it's not -- it's perfectly theoretically possible to go ahead and redevelop some of those sites, it is a major, major barrier, although artificial.

And just keeping it brief, the final issue we'd like to bring to your attention is the McCann Road issue. On the preferred alternative on the far I guess northwest corner of the map there's a small section of land that is proposed to be removed from the Vancouver UGA and replaced as rural residential. In reviewing the County's vacant buildable lands model they've kind of added it as a footnote at the bottom of that. The Vancouver total for accounting for population capacity does not reflect the conversion of 134 vacant and 37 underutilized acres from urban residential to rural residential. If this is removed it will reduce the total capacity by to 114,000, which is about 3,000 less people than is currently proposed in their vacant buildable lands model and we would just like to bring that to the Planning Commission's attention that there will be a need to bring in a couple additional residential acres to accommodate for that. And that will conclude my testimony at this time regarding the general comments unless there's any questions.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Howsley or Mr. Johnson?

WRISTON: Do you have a feel for the percentage of lands on the private covenants? You just give a small sampling, you don't really have a feel for --

JOHNSON: Small sampling on that and the percentage --

LEIN: Excuse me, Todd, for the record could you identify yourself.

JOHNSON: Sure. I'm Todd Johnson, I'm with Olson Engineering, 1111 Broadway, Vancouver, Washington.

LEIN: Thank you.

JOHNSON: We did a relatively small sample area, but what we noticed in that sample area that we were able to project that you were likely to find about 20 percent.

WRISTON: I believe that.

JOHNSON: A lot of the rural lands in our sample area we actually found a higher

percentage, but that was primarily due to the closeness in which is primarily where you'd expand the urban growth boundary so.

WRISTON: And especially in-fill as well; right? I mean a lot of the in-fill areas (inaudible)?

JOHNSON: A lot of the in-fill areas, we didn't actually do any study of anything that was already inside the urban growth boundary that would be eligible for in-fill, but certainly it would impact those as well.

HOWSLEY: And we've submitted that as Exhibit F. Obviously it's a pretty big stack of covenants, we didn't want to waste money by -- and waste trees by printing it all off.

MOSS: Todd, where was your study area generally? In what part of the county?

JOHNSON: We actually picked a few focus points. There was one that was just north of Fisher Swale, and then we picked a couple of spots up around the urban growth boundary, just kind of generally where we knew that there were some residential developments, primarily the 5-acre tracts and such. And then we also picked one on the outskirts of Battle Ground. If you'd like I can submit a map that shows our sample areas. I didn't bring one with me tonight.

MOSS: Thank you.

LEIN: That would be interesting if you could submit that, Todd, please.

JOHNSON: Sure can.

HOWSLEY: Just in conclusion with that, to address some of the minor concerns, including the private covenants, we would just ask that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board a readoption of the market factor but at a very low percentage of 10 percent.

LEIN: Of what percent, Mr. Howsley?

HOWSLEY: Of 10 percent for market factor of residential lands.

LEIN: Any other questions? Okay. If not, we'll close -- not close the hearing but we'll take about a 15-minute break and reconvene the hearing at 6:30. Like I indicated, there's probably still people signing up so I will try to let you know how long we're going to go here with the way people are testifying.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: We'd like to reconvene the hearing, please. With four and a half pages of sign-ups here I'd like to ask a question of the audience in terms of how many people here would like

to limit the length of testimony. If you'd raise your hands. Okay, we've got about half or more.

AUDIENCE: There's no way we're all going to get in.

LEIN: Well, we know we will continue it on. What we'd like to do is instigate about a five minute situation, try to limit your testimony to five minutes as much as possible. If we see that you're going over that -- Mr. Howsley.

HOWSLEY: Is that five minutes for each request?

LEIN: Yes, it will be five minutes for each request. There are some people in the audience representing more than one property owner, okay.

AUDIENCE: Is that for each request or each sign-up?

LEIN: Each new request. We have some people that are signed up three or four times, I would call that a new request. Also to let you know, we will continue this this evening until about 10:00. We'll take our last testimony before 10:00 and complete that. We have now four and a half pages, the last time I calculated how long it would take we had two and a half, I figured that would be somewhere between 9 and 13 hours at the rate it was going. If we get this situation to the five minutes, what I'd like to do is find out where we're at our next break so that then we can make a determination of how long we think we're going to go and you won't have to sit here for the extra two hours. So we will do our best to let you know, but at this point if you are on Page 3 or 4 I'm not sure you will get there. If you are on Page 4 I would recommend that you go home at this point because we will probably not get to you this evening.

AUDIENCE: Could you read the names on Page 4?

LEIN: Mr. Lee, did you have a comment?

LEE: No. But we would be continuing it. Those --

LEIN: Yeah, we would be continuing the hearing --

LEE: To next week.

LEIN: -- to next week. It would be at City Hall starting at 6:30. Correct? City Hall?

WISER: Yes.

LEIN: The names on Page 4 are Mike Wynne, Treasure Delashaw, James Bristow, Mary Bristow, Sharon Martell, Vickie Oates, Leo Oates, Pete Star or Skar, I'm sorry, Lena

Lerner, Brian Treasure, Henry Lasch, Neal or Paula Schoen, Tom Franzel, Larry Wilson, Ron Wetsman, Mike Langsdorf, George Bateman, Robert Pettit. Those are the names on 4. I don't know if there's any other additional sign-ups past that. If I haven't written your name, it would be the other. Yes.

AUDIENCE: Yeah, if I'm on that list but I can't come next week?

LEIN: Well, the way it's going you'll have an opportunity anyway. We'll still be picking it up, okay. And if you can't come, if nothing else be sure that you get your written testimony in to County staff. That can be done in written form or it can be done in an E-mail, okay. Anything else before we go? Okay. Let's start out with Bridget Schwarz.

SCHWARZ: Hi, my name is Bridget Schwarz. I live at 2110 NW 179th Street. I'm also going to wear my George Vartanian hat. I think he's next on your speaker list and he could not be here tonight. I'm testifying on behalf of the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association, but first I want to comment that for those of us out here that are insomniacs or thrive on sleep deprivation, we want to thank you guys for being such great enablers. The Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association is very involved in this growth management process, probably mostly as a result of the last time we did a GMA update. If you'll look at the map, when you expanded the urban growth boundary an awful lot of it was within our turf and we've been living with the results ever since. And I'm going to tell you about the results of surveys that we take of our members so you can see where we stand on some of these issues.

Two years ago we asked our members about the impacts of the last GMA update on their typical commute time. 64 percent said that their commute time had increased. Of that over half had had an increase anywhere from 5 to 10 minutes. We also dealt with a plot where there were 24 acres available for commercial development, but under the Growth Management Act there were zero trips assigned to that particular plot. Much to our surprise Costco came in and decided this would be a swell place for their location. Because of the transportation impacts they did move on, but we did have to take a look at what it was like to look at a big box store like that that would be going into an area that had (inaudible) mansions and high-end townhouses and condos all around it. So we asked our members: There are no aesthetic design standards for commercial development in the County Code. Should the Code include standards of compatibility with neighborhood character as a criteria for permitting the project, I dropped a digit in the answer that I gave to you, it's 90 percent said yes.

We also looked at the kinds of growth that we were getting. We're getting virtually every fast food outlet and gas station known to man. So we asked our members about the commercial zoning. Commercial zoning allowances are broadly defined. Should the current commercial zone code be separated into two or more categories, 80 percent said yes. If so, should there be one designated for non-family wage jobs, 86 percent said yes. Again, these are things that we were looking at as far as the result of the last comp plan

update. Those questions were asked two years ago.

Then in January of this year, I'm going to give you survey results that will hopefully convince you to really, really pay attention to our testimony. We asked our members: Did you attend any of the comprehensive plan meetings last September where five alternatives were shown as part of the growth management plan update, 20 percent of our members were there. That's a huge number. If yes, did you find on at least one alternative a zone change on your property, 59 percent said yes. If yes, were you pleased with the zone change proposal on your property, 88 percent said no. So we are very involved in the process and have been taking a look at it.

Last July the map that's behind you Proposed Comprehensive Plan 2003/2023 we got and we took a look at and we had none of the other documentation but that to go on and we got another series of survey questions into our membership. We gave them an explanation that was included but not on the same page as the survey so they went and read background on why we asked them questions and this is what we told them. The urban growth boundary will move north to 199th Street, west to NW 11th Avenue, east and NW 29th Street, that's a one mile movement north and two miles wide, that's all new area that you're adding to the urban growth. Moving outward from I-5 the additional land have three different zonings, we asked them about that. And we also pointed out that despite the fact that the 219th Street interchange appears inevitable in these proposals, there's virtually no land use planning on that.

So we asked our members: Should the 20 year comprehensive plan update address zoning changes in recognition of the increased pressure for development that will be caused by the 219th Street interchange, 87 percent of our members said yes. Should the County revise the mixed use zoning definition, there's tons of it in that area I described, so that it limits allowable commercial uses, 82 percent said yes. Should new and revised zoning classifications and definitions be established before public input on the proposed alternative for the comp plan update, that was kind of a wash. But we lost on that one anyway, we're here. Should the County stop accepting development applications within the newly expanded urban growth boundary until land use codes have been reviewed and updated, 83 percent said yes. And since we got the map and we got the documentation those codes as far as changes are included in the EIS. Should the County allocate trip generation numbers based on the percentage of jobs versus residential traffic generated by mixed use developments, 61 percent said yes. We are looking at that because when we resolve the Salmon Creek Development Moratorium, we allocated trips and we allocated them on residential versus industrial or jobs. And if you look at where we're at right now not even six months after we finally got the moratorium off, we're just about done with residential. So in the mixed use development we need to be allocating the trips as far as how they're generated because at some point housing growth is going to have to stop again.

As a result of the survey results, basically our recommendation is that we actually -- we

really want to insist if you look at the designation for the industrial land in that urban growth and you look at the chart on the map there it just says "industrial," it doesn't say whether it's light or heavy, we want light industrial. If you look at the next ring out of mixed use there's a lot of that, acres and acres of it, but if you look at the current mixed use code you could have a 200,000-square foot store in there and that's 50,000 feet bigger than a Costco. The proposal is that we change it to 100,000-square feet but that's still a huge store for a mixed use development. We want the revised mixed use code to be what's adopted and we want it made clear that that's what will apply. Then the third ring out on this --

LEIN: Your five minutes is up. Can you give a real quick summary, please.

SCHWARZ: Okay. The third ring is a residential. It doesn't say what kind on the map and we want to make sure that that's going to be high-density residential.

LEIN: Any questions? Thank you.

SCHWARZ: I need -- now I'm George Vartanian, he's next on your list. He resides at 2217 NE 179th Street, Suite 5, and he also is a member of the executive board of the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association. Our comments are general in nature because the information on the comp plan has only been available for two weeks; however, there's been specific correspondence that you already have on file. While the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association does not have any major philosophical issues with the proposed map showing expansions in the urban growth boundaries, there are a number of important questions and vital issues the membership wants to see addressed before final approval is granted.

First, further clarify the mixed use commercial, residential and industrial areas identified in the expanded UGA within our neighborhood association and also the other boundaries. We want to know what kinds of commercial, residential and industrial classifications are being considered. Also in the case of mixed use we want to make sure you're allocating trips based on the square footage of the different uses; in other words, different trips for each of the different land use applications.

Number two, bring any new additions to the UGAs in as urban holding. Do not permit new development in these areas until subarea planning is complete with input from the public and the infrastructure is provided for. Furthermore, the subarea planning should be done under the jurisdiction in which the subarea resides at the time of the planning. While we're not promoting this development immediately it may become desirable in the future and the area may not be annexed or incorporated for a very long time, so the area may have a different approach to development than the jurisdiction remote from this area that will eventually perhaps consider doing an annexation.

Third, make it clear in the comp plan that neighborhood livability issues are addressed before development is approved. Fourth, the comp plan should require a gradual transition

for most intense and intrusive land use development to the least so as to impact it -- to minimize impacts to adjacent areas. Five, emphasize bringing in employers who operate more than one shift so that employment per acre is maximized. Sixth, notify more of the community of proposed developments by sending notices to more than the current 500 foot distance from the development, especially where the development has an impact greater than 500 feet. Surely you can see that the big box stores and hospitals and universities are regional rather than 500-foot impacts. Additionally the notices should be sent not only to property owners but to all residents. Typically notices about development are only sent to the owners, renters and individual property owners of condominiums and townhouses do not get notification because they don't own the land.

Seventh, as part of the deliberations we ask the Planning Commission to approve the proposed changes in the mixed zoning district. We ask that these changes be approved once the size of the retail and the commercial development is reduced, reduced to 75,000-square feet. Establishments larger than 75,000-square feet really belong in the community or the highway commercial zones and those zones are already in existence in abundance right next to these areas. Also we ask that at least 30 percent of the square footage be dedicated to residences and that they easily spread throughout the development. That may be that's part of the mixed use zone code changes, but it is not abundantly clear and so we want to make sure abundantly clear that you get that. So thank you for the opportunity to present our testimony and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

LEIN: Any questions of Bridget?

BARCA: Is George's testimony --

SCHWARZ: George is what I just read.

LEIN: Is it written?

SCHWARZ: He's already submitted it.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Matt Lewis. The microphone up here is quite sensitive, you need to keep your mouth at the microphone because otherwise it tends to lose you. And I know sometimes it's difficult to hear in the back. We have a combination of everybody wanting to be as vocal as they can in the five minutes and we have a court reporter that needs to be able to understand what you're saying at the same time, so have some patience there or she'll get real nasty with us.

LEWIS: Chairman Lein, I was going to ask for five minutes on behalf of all 780 of my members but I guess we'll forego that. My name is Matt Lewis, I work for the Building

Industry Association. We're a trade association comprised of those businesses within the construction industry including general contractors and all the supporting trades. The first question is a procedural one and I guess it's directed towards Mr. Lee. I was wondering how when testimony concludes in the next couple of weeks and it moves to deliberations how those are going to be organized because there's a deluge of very specific requests or recommendations coming in and I would hope that they wouldn't be lost. I don't know if they're going to be itemized by staff and then gone through by the Planning Commission. I was just wondering exactly how that's going to work.

LEE: Yeah, we are proposing to compile a comprehensive list of the various changes that have been put on the table and sort of work through from that basis under the umbrella of some of the countywide planning policies that are also being put on the table.

LEWIS: Okay, that works well. And in fact I'll have four specific items that I would like the Planning Commission to consider and take action on. First, though, I'd like to show a couple of slides. There's been lengthy testimony this evening about the costs of growth and certainly they're there, but there's also the benefits and we need to acknowledge that. Here's a couple of quick numbers. \$1.6 billion in total volume residential sales. This doesn't include multi-family. 450 million was new construction, about 27 percent of all residential activities in new construction. That's over 10,000 jobs, \$352 million worth of payroll in the direct jobs associated with building and land development. When you get into some of the peripheral industries, engineers, attorneys, realtors, home furnishing retailers, that number, that figure would of course increase. And of course there's the public contributions which are most important for capital facilities planning, property tax obviously, impact fees for school, parks, roads, fire, a real estate excise tax charged on every property transaction from raw land to a finished home, sales tax is charged on materials and labor, and of course when the new home buyer moves in there's significant spikes in retail spending as they furnish their home, and then of course a new home begins to pay property tax, utility tax, et cetera. So there are costs but there certainly are gains. The BIA has been involved in the, not yet, in the comp plan update since the original one in '94. Our guiding approach has been use strong, accurate, defensible data to craft a balanced plan and unfortunately we're failing in that principle as far as the accurate data on a number of points and I'd like to speak to those specifically.

The first one are the conversion of underutilized parcels. And, Evan, you can put that first photograph up, please. One of the assumptions is that there's an underutilized category that includes parcels between one acre and two and a half with less than \$325,000 structural improvements not including the land. Many of these properties look like this, very stately, valuable homes. The expectation is that 70 percent of these properties will convert or further develop to the maximum of their underlying density. We find this highly unrealistic. If the value of the home would not further prevent the development, the prerogative of the landowner, the orientation of the structure, the value of adjacent structures, access on to the site, there's a number, CC&R's as mentioned earlier, there's a number of inhibitors to full build out of these properties.

I'll take you through a couple of them. Here's an example. This one is not even pushing \$325,000 threshold and obviously it's a very nice home. If you go to the next one, Evan. And there was a packet that was submitted last week, it's probably buried in your other items. Again similar situation, a large home. While the structural value of the improvements is less than \$325,000, I put my money that this is not going to further subdivide in the very near future. And there's one final one, it's the -- it's more of the same.

And actually I have -- we hired a consultant to do a field survey of these, I have several thousand of photographs of similar properties. The bottom line is including these properties greatly overstates the amount of buildable land, which in turn reduces the amount of new land needed to house our inevitable growing population. The BIA would recommend that the 70 percent conversion factor, that is 70 percent of these properties will fully build out, be reduced between 30 and 50 percent and this will compensate for the prevalence of these larger lot homes with high, high value structures on them. Certainly there are some old dilapidated homes that will be moved or knocked down and demolished and redeveloped, but the 70 percent is too high of an assumption.

The second item is the infrastructure deduction. I think the best data you will receive, and perhaps the only data you will receive, was presented earlier by Mr. Howsley, a courtesy of Olson Engineering, and this rebuts the previous sole piece of evidence of a study submitted by the City of Vancouver which was a three or four page memo which the Commissioners based their decision to move from a 38 percent infrastructure deduction which they had used for the prior three years of the entire GMA planning process and with the flick of a button took it down to 27 and a half percent thereby eliminating about a 2,000 acre expansion. And the results of the analysis done by Olson Engineering clearly show that when you use GIS, take all the land uses and deduct the amount that goes to all the various types of infrastructure which include roads, easements, schools, parks, power lines, police stations, stormwater facilities, expanded arterials, pump station, water reservoirs, fire stations, buffers, regional public facilities and sidewalks, you come up with a much -- a figure closer to I think it was 44 percent was from Olson Engineering, and I believe the 28 percent put forward from the City of Vancouver was lower because they excluded vacant and under -- or they, excuse me, they included vacant and underutilized properties in the entire analysis which obviously the infrastructure hasn't been built out yet so there's going to be a lower total amount. We would encourage the Planning Commission to reinstate the 38 percent infrastructure deduction based on the actual analysis performed by Olson Engineering.

The other assumption change that drastically altered the shape of the map and the size of the expansion was the elimination of the market factor for residential land. It was included for commercial and industrial purposes. The reason given for the elimination of the market factor was to create a more transparent planning process using real numbers; however, the market factor wasn't some concoction of the development community to balloon the boundary expansion, it's an accepted urban planning tool. It's in fact mentioned in two

State handbooks put out by the Office of Trade & Community Development, one of which is called Providing Adequate Urban Area Land Supply, and the Buildable Lands Program Guide from 2000. By eliminating that, by including these types of properties, we're leaving no margin for error, further tightening that land supply, driving up prices and manipulating the market contrary to our free market, principles that our economy is based upon.

The fourth item is urban holding. This has been touched upon earlier. Urban holding is an acceptable planning policy for those areas directly contiguous -- those undeveloped areas directly contiguous to an incorporated municipality where annexation is likely; however, to put areas north of the fairgrounds or in the fringe of the Vancouver urban growth area that are miles away from municipal Vancouver is not logical. To require them to have to be served by infrastructure is fair, but to require some sort of subarea planning process in which the City of Vancouver is a participant when they are five to six to seven to eight miles away I fail to understand how that benefits the entire area. And it should be noted that GMA requires a 20 year buildable land supply. I've already demonstrated that we're using some questionable numbers and assumptions in reaching this 20 year land supply. If we then put all new expansion areas in urban holding, we're creating phantom capacity. Where are the people going to live.

I would tend to disagree with Mr. Karpinski that no new areas are needed for jobs or houses.

LEIN: Matt, can you summarize your last point here.

LEWIS: Yeah. The last point, and the last slide, I mentioned supply and demand earlier, this all influences price. The far right, these are August '03 numbers, this is just for single-family homes. Median price, half sales are above, half are below, \$198,000, about to eclipse the \$200,000 mark. For existing homes it's 164,500. You look at plan adoption in 1994 we were at 124 for new, 111 in existing. Obviously the growth and demand interest rates influence this, but the reduction in supply or the control on supply is certainly a large contributing factor and it's only going to increase. I'd encourage you to make those recommended changes and provide adequate land supply for a growing population to ensure housing opportunities for the future. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Lewis? Thank you. Candace Challenor.

CHALLENGOR: My name is Candace Challenor. I live at 10113 NE 37th Street. I'm representing two groups tonight, the first will be the League of Women Voters. First of all I want to thank you for this opportunity to make comments on the planning. The League of Women Voters supports conservation of nonrenewable land resources such as agricultural, forestry lands, wetlands and aggregate mining areas. The criteria to determine areas to be conserved should include social, environmental and economic factors with emphasis on retention of physical characteristics. We support a flexible combination of implementation techniques such as creative zoning, performance standards, transferable

development rights, purchase of development rights, fee simple purchase, agricultural and forestry or mineral aggregate districts and tax policies to achieve conservation of nonrenewable land resources depending on local condition. Purchase of development rights should be most appropriate for lands in close proximity to urban areas.

We support the concept that developers should be required to contribute to cost of public services which are a direct result of their development. Parks and recreational facilities are an important element of any community and should be considered as a priority. Every effort should be made to make parks and recreational facilities safe places for all citizens. Realizing local governmental budget pressures we favor the exploration and utilization of alternate methods of funding, including but not limited to LIDs, bond issues and user fees for both developed and undeveloped recreational sites. Recreational facilities should be balanced to serve diverse recreational interests to include both developed and undeveloped areas. Where a need is demonstrated we support bond issues for the construction of swimming pools and other highly developed recreational facilities. We strongly recommend that parks departments and the school districts combine efforts for recreation facilities for the use of the total community, including park acquisitions and swimming pools. That concludes my statement for the League of Women Voters.

I'm also speaking for the Sierra Club which in Clark County represents about 1300 members. This is going to be -- I'm going to take segments of each one because it's a rather long statement, but I'll also be submitting the full statement. Again, thank you for this opportunity to comment.

The Draft Environmental Impact Study recently released includes many of the diverse considerations that make up growth management planning. Thank you for the thought, objectivity and intention that went into the contents. Thank you also for designating priority habitat. Designating priority habitat is critical. Maintaining those habitat in their natural state, developing effective critical area ordinances and enforcing those standards, developing effective mitigation standards and enforcing them as well as effectively enforcing the Endangered Species Act and water air quality standards are critical to sustainable quality of life and our survival. We also must develop construction techniques for roads and transportation systems that pass through wildlife habitat and respective movement corridors in such a way that to allow for free movement of wildlife.

Another critical component of growth management is water quality. We must do all we can to protect the quality of water that exists today. If the County's decision is to attract more industry, we must accept the challenge of attracting industry without lowering air and water quality standards. The DEIS clearly demonstrates that no expansion of current urban growth boundaries is preferable. Develop buffers that effectively minimize the impact of development on watersheds and wildlife habitat. Establish stringent penalties for violators and support enforcement efforts. Encourage the development of effective mass transit alternatives, including multiple transportation options.

We also encourage that not to consider industry that can't or won't meet current or more stringent environmental standards. Encourage industry business that can and will meet these standards. Be generous with incentives for those that do. We ask the County planners to also consider managed growth within the existing urban growth boundary as our best choice for sustaining quality of life in Clark County. Thank you.

LEIN: Are there any questions from members of the Commission? Thank you. Steve Stuart.

STUART: Thank you, Commissioners. For the record my name is Steve Stuart and I'm the executive director of Friends of Clark County, which is a countywide member based group 400 members countywide representing reasonable growth and quality of life. While we appreciate a lot of the hard work that's gone into preparing the proposed alternatives and as far as we've already gone in this process, we do have some concerns with the proposed alternative as it sits. What I'll touch on tonight with the limited time and being that we'll be talking about capital facilities costs next week is some of the assumptions that were talked about by Matt Lewis from the BIA and by others as well.

One of the key with the -- I'm sorry, I'm getting used to the microphone here. One of the key with the assumptions is using real numbers, and Matt mentioned that, and we absolutely agree that we need to be using real numbers, but what was not mentioned is that there's a whole package of assumptions here and only parts of them have been mentioned. We also have to talk about the 1.83 percent growth percentage, growth rate percentage, that is now being used for, you know, a year and a half, two years. Since 2001 it was 1.5 percent, with a flick of a button it's now 1.83 percent, so if we want to talk about the area that's being included in expansion, that had a great deal to do with the overall percentage and the overall acreage that's being used. We actually think that the 1.83 percent is fine, it's well within the range of what OFM had projected, it settles in at about the mid range, which is, which is fine, but we also agree that the infrastructure percentage that was chosen, the 27.5 percent is also appropriate, it's based on observed numbers. While we don't dispute the Olson Engineering study that was done, the City of Vancouver based its numbers on what it had observed over the past five years and we definitely see that as a very credible source.

As far as the market factor goes, the market factor may not be used as an artificial inflation tool but it's not necessary. And the simple reason is that by law the Growth Management Act requires that 10 years from now we go back and we revisit the land supply, so we already have a 50 percent market factor built in. If we're talking about a 20 year land supply and we're coming back in 10 years, we only -- if we've used all of it by then, we can come back and we can revisit that and we can actually say do we need more at that point, but to include the market factor now does artificially inflate the land supply that's created at this time. And the problem with that is that if we artificially inflate it, we're deflating the downtown revitalization efforts that are going on in every one of our cities, Battle Ground, Camas, Washougal, Vancouver,

Ridgefield, they're all doing it. They're all doing a great job of downtown revitalization, the best way to kill it is by adding a lot of expansion areas on the perimeter. Because if you spend all your resources on the perimeter, what resources are left for the core.

The other piece of this is the urban industrial reserves. We're actually strongly in support of studying the Discovery Corridor concept, looking long-term at what kinds of nodes can we develop along I-5 as we head north. We do have a great underused infrastructure in I-5 northbound and so why shouldn't we look at that long-term and look at industrial reserves up near La Center, potentially on the north side of Ridgefield, and even as we're looking at up above the fairgrounds area with the new 219th interchange that's going to come in within the next 6 to 10 years. It's definitely something worth at least starting to look at so that we can at least set that land aside so those large parcels of land are held firm and so that they're not broken up to the point where we can't use them for industry. And that's probably the biggest concern we have with not putting the 219th interchange in, a study area right now is parcelizing it out.

Beyond the actual assumptions the kind of individual pieces that created the need for expansion we also agree that the reduction of the urban growth boundary near the Felida area, there's about 300 acres of agricultural land that's in the proposed alternative would be removed from the urban growth boundary and that is pure agricultural land. We've actually gone out and ground truthed it and there are a lot of that land. While there may be a few parcels that may not be appropriate for that, the vast majority are being used for ag right now and, frankly, we're concerned that 2700 acres of ag land are going to be converted in this proposed alternative. The 300 acres being taken out of the urban growth boundary is a nice start, but 2700 acres of ag land is going to be converted. I mean that's, that's just -- it boggles our mind to think that we are losing that much as far as our farming population and our ability to feed ourselves and for our kids to know where their food comes from, you know, that's just something that is not okay.

The other thing I wanted to talk about tonight quickly is density. It doesn't have to be a four letter word. It doesn't have to be everywhere. There are areas where it's appropriate, there are areas where it's not appropriate. I actually loved those slides that Mr. Lewis showed about the underutilized parcels because one of the things that has been spoken of a lot is that we don't want to cram people into these new growth areas, we want to make sure that we have plenty of land for large-scale development. Well, I absolutely agree that the building trades are an incredibly important part of our community and will continue to be so, it's necessary; however, that doesn't mean it has to be large lot subdivisions. What we are trying to preserve is a mix of life-styles and the only way to preserve the mix of life-styles is to make sure we have that mix and the first thing to go right now is our rural life-style. Those rural life-styles are going to be run over by large lot subdivisions if we don't watch out. We have large lot subdivisions. Mr. Lewis said he had several thousand pictures of large lot subdivision lots and those are just the pictures he has. I mean anecdotally I grew up in this county, I know of lots of subdivisions with 10 to 15 to 20,000-square foot lots, we're not lacking as far as that goes, so maybe it's okay that we

have 5 to 10,000-square foot lots in the expansion areas, maybe it's okay that we don't expand so much so that we can preserve our rural life-style as well. I'll say that for now and then I'll take any questions you have.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Stuart?

AUDIENCE: Yeah, I got one.

LEIN: I'm sorry, it's for us, thank you.

AUDIENCE: Nice try.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Stuart.

STUART: Thank you.

LEIN: Bob Hatch, please.

HATCH: Thank you. My name is Bob Hatch. I live at 19006 NE Delfel Road out in the Ridgefield area. I'm going to make this brief and to the point as I don't have a great deal of need to hear myself read the whole letter. I'm just urging the Board to not place the urban holding overlays in those areas out there. The problem is that for those of us that own property, and I'm scheduled to be zoned mixed use, it puts us in a real kind of limbo situation. What do we do with a house that might sell in a year or two years or maybe less that needs a new deck, repairs, siding, roofing, everything else like that that if we go ahead and do those repairs it's tossed money because in a mixed use or a high density situation, the builder is going to come in there and the only thing they'll do is knock it down with a D-9 CAT. So I'm saying give us a break, the property owners that actually will be impacted the most, and hold that or don't put that urban growth holding area on there. I'm open to questions.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Hatch? Thank you. Jana or Jim Sassalos. Excuse me, Sassalos.

SASSALOS: My name is Jane Sassalos. I live at 4073 North Montana Avenue in Portland, Oregon, but this is regarding two parcels that we own in the Rolling Hills area north or west of the proposed 502/219 interchange. And let me identify that property. It's not targeted for a zone change at this time as far as we know. I'm concerned about the 20 year long-range plan and how it may change the quiet enjoyment of my property as it now exists. My husband and I have 30 acres off NW 11th Avenue, 20 of which are four lots in the Rolling Hills Phase III with the remaining 10 acres used as agricultural. Our farm name is Rolling Hills TB, LLC. This is a functioning working farm and we have invested heavily with improvements including an approved septic system as permitted by Clark County. My husband and I have had our own 20 year plan and purchased the 30 acres in Clark County approximately 15 years ago. We have a fabulous view of four mountains. We plan to

retire on our property and enjoy the view. I now feel this property is most at risk by the SR-502/I-5 interchange proposed by the State of Washington.

Besides the disruption of the beauty of the Rolling Hills III and IV, it is not clear what is being done on the west side of I-5. We have not received any notice of zone change; however, we did receive a letter from the Department of Transportation to facilitate project analysis work such as surveying, appraisal, environmental analysis and/or archeological survey work. Why would they need to do this unless the 502/219 continue on the west side of the freeway. Should this happen and a new road is built ripping our 30-acre tract apart, I ask what are they thinking. This would have a diminishing effect on the prime real estate and would have to lower the taxes. This is not growth, nor will it enhance the area nor generate jobs or housing, this would seem counterproductive to the goals of Clark County and the public at large. I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak tonight. I was one that was bumped off the agenda last meeting and I thank you.

LEIN: Any questions from members of the Commission?

BARCA: I have a question on your map before you go. I see the 10-acre parcel is noted. The parcels below that, how many acres are each one of those?

SASSALOS: That's the 20 acres in the Rolling Hills Subdivision Phase III. They're 5-acre lots.

BARCA: 5 acres?

SASSALOS: Uh-huh.

BARCA: All right. Thank you.

SASSALOS: Thank you.

LEIN: Michelle Cotner.

COTNER: Actually I was forced to sign in. I have nothing to say but I'll auction my position to anyone.

LEIN: I don't think we have enough time to auction it. I know there's too many people that would give you a good price for it. Alison or Richard Strobel.

STROBEL: Hello, my name is Alison Strobel and I'm speaking for both me and my husband. We would like to express our -- oh, we live at 5305 NE 132nd Way in Vancouver. I've handed out a map which unfortunately can't go up. The area we live in is this big blue section which is currently being zoned -- is proposed to be zoned business park. Our piece happens to be the hatchet shaped piece on there if you see that. We

would like to express our opinion concerning the proposed comprehensive growth management plan. We own 5 acres bordering 50th Avenue and the south edge of the Philbrooks' property. The plan currently proposes that the Philbrooks' property, our property and our neighbors to the east, west and south all be zoned office campus/business park. Development in this area over the last 13 years has had a low density residential character. We would like to see the area continue to develop along these lines and we support the Philbrooks' plan to when the time comes develop attractive low density residential homes. Having talked with all our adjacent neighbors I can say we unanimously agree that Pleasant Valley should remain pleasant and that this can best be accomplished with low density residential zoning for our properties, not office campus/business park.

As I am sure you are aware, Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association has also voiced their preference for low density residential zoning for this area. We want to see Clark County grow into a thriving, environmentally healthy and attractive community, a place where we can work and play. This can be accomplished by placing jobs along major transportation corridors and providing a variety of neighborhoods to satisfy the needs of a diverse population. Thank you for the opportunity to express our opinions concerning the plan for development in the Pleasant Valley area. We sincerely hope Pleasant Valley will remain a desirable place to live. Thank you. Are there any questions?

LEIN: Any questions from members of the Commission?

BARCA: I have a question.

STROBEL: Yeah.

BARCA: After hearing the neighborhood association testify on this and getting a clear understanding that the office campus zoning is in opposition, I'm wondering about the aspect of neighborhood commercial node, something that's small, a commercial outlet type to serve the area. Is there any discussion of that type of zone change going on?

STROBEL: The discussions we have had we all feel that 72nd Avenue is a more appropriate place for that type of zoning.

BARCA: For even something to serve your own neighborhood you'd prefer to get in your car and drive out to 72nd than have something --

STROBEL: Sure. I'll hop on my bicycle perhaps.

BARCA: On 72nd?

STROBEL: Well, not without a bike lane. Would you consider one of those?

BARCA: I think zone changes are easier than bike lanes somehow.

STROBEL: Is that it?

BARCA: Yes.

LEIN: Thank you very much.

STROBEL: You're welcome.

LEIN: Ron Bellis. Is there a Ron Bellis, B-e-l-l-i-s? Randy Printz.

PRINTZ: Good evening. Can I testify from there because I've got some overheads?

LEIN: Sure, as long as there's a microphone.

PRINTZ: (Inaudible). I'm not going to repeat, my address is 915 Broadway. I'm not going to repeat all of the sort of big picture issues for the comp plan tonight, a lot of folks have already done that. I do believe, however, that this process to date is doing pretty much exactly what GMA says we're not supposed to be doing, which is to underplan, to not assure that there is adequate infrastructure and adequate land for the folks that are going to come here. We have used the most conservative assumptions that literally are available to us. The 1.83 growth rate that was just spoken about, when you take the market factor out, it puts you back down at 1.5 or less, which is the very bottom of the range that OFM gave us. The infrastructure assumptions clearly are inadequate. You can look at the engineering studies and even the City of Vancouver I think would agree that the assumptions that they used also included vacant yet undevelopable land or undeveloped land. The areas for that are currently underutilized. If you go out and do an inventory of that, and you can look at the pictures that Matt put up there, there are certainly a lot of, a lot of lands out there that can be redeveloped.

But I sat on the committee that the Board appointed to try to go through these assumptions about a year and a half ago, which was theoretically a bipartisan committee used to sort of come up with the base for those, and at the time that those assumptions were made the assumption that was given to us by staff was that there was only about less than 500 acres of that underutilized property out there, particularly those parcels between zero and one and a half acres which are the pieces obviously that have most of the large homes on it. It turns out that there's about 2,000 plus acres of that out there with the assumption that 70 percent of those will convert and to much lower densities, things like, you know, Fair Acres and those sorts of developments and that's simply not going to happen.

The other major assumption is that a fair portion of properties or land with critical areas on them will also be developable at some percentage. For those of us who spend an inordinate amount of time with not only Clark County's folks but National Marine Fishery

Service, US Fish & Wildlife, the Corp and DOE, all of you know and I know that this the Planning Commission knows that the number one criteria on the list today is avoidance and if you were going to try to fill anything more than a half an acre of wetland and take yourself outside of a nationwide permit and put you into an individual permit, the odds of having that, of getting that permit, are very very small.

I've got about 10 parcels that I'm going to talk about tonight. I will try to make those much less than an average of five minutes apiece. I see Vaughn smiling.

LEIN: Thank you.

PRINTZ: Most of these are already proposed for inclusion in the boundary. This piece is at the intersection of 119th which runs along here and 72nd Avenue. This was originally proposed to come in as part of it being commercial and part of it industrial. The current proposal by staff is that this be commercial but this be mixed use. We support the inclusion of this property inside the UGA but not with the, but not with the MX designation here. I'm probably maybe the only speaker that you will hear tonight or next week that is actually here asking you to give us a piece of industrial zoning where we could otherwise do residential or commercial, but that is in fact the case and for a variety of reasons.

First of all, on this piece because there is already a large 20-acre piece of C-3 that will go there, the mixed use ordinance requires 30 percent of this then to become commercial and there simply isn't going to be the demand for commercial in this area when you put 20 acres here. The other issue is the MX ordinance requires you to do high density or very fairly high-density development at a minimum of 12 units per acre up to a max I think of about 40 units per acre. And that's gross acre. The areas around this are relatively rural. This is the edge of the boundary. It's simply not a great site to do high density residential development. There's good transportation here. You've got a large piece of area to be developed or that could be an industrial development here and this simply seems like a much better place for industrial than high density residential.

BARCA: I need a clarification.

PRINTZ: Sure.

BARCA: You are asking for industrial?

PRINTZ: Yes, on that. I'm asking for industrial on the part that the County currently is proposing to have be commercial is what I'm outlining here, the remaining portion of this, follow this, we would like to see as industrial.

BARCA: That's how many acres?

PRINTZ: That remaining portion I think is about 40.

BARCA: 40 acres light industrial, heavy industrial?

PRINTZ: Light industrial.

BARCA: Light industrial.

PRINTZ: This next piece is also on 119th except it is at sort of the other end of the 119th corridor at the east end. 117th is over here, this is just to the east at 117th. This street here is about 138th. On the County's five alternatives this was designated -- and for those alternatives that included it inside the UGA it was designated as either residential or commercial. We met with staff, and in fact I think two of them, two out of the three recommended commercial. We met with staff and talked about this being an area that it was in and the size of the piece that it likely would be too large for a commercial development. What we talked about was doing a corner of this as commercial, which would be possible, and doing the remaining portions in single-family. When the most recent proposal came out this was zoned business park and for many of the reasons that I just discussed on the other piece, on the Gramor piece, this site does not have those qualities. Number one, you've got residential subdivisions around you. Number two, you don't have the 72nd corridor going to the St. Johns industrial area or to 205. You don't have very good transportation capacity in here as it exists for trucks. Based on this location and the surrounding neighborhood that's here this just does not look like a great place to do BP, but probably a much better place to do single-family residential.

BARCA: That's your request?

PRINTZ: Yes, that's correct. All of these that I'm talking about there is a substantial amount of written material in your record on each of these. The next three I'm going to try to take and put together and do them all at once, they are close together, they are also in the 119th corridor, and they are all being proposed for the same thing. One is Frasier. And I'll try to orient you here. 119th Street is up here kind of at the top. These are the railroad tracks that you probably recognize running through this part of the county. 117th is over here, and quite away over here, and 99th Street is down in here. So there is this piece, this piece which is adjacent to the piece that I just showed you also in the same location, 119th, 99th, the railroad tracks, this is the Frasier piece that I just showed you. And then the Horsley piece which is just a little bit to the west or the east of that, those pieces set right about in here. 117th is over here. Again 119th is up at the top, and 99th, this is 99th Street down here. All of these were requested to be in the boundary and be zoned with some residential designation. They all are currently being proposed for inside the boundary which certainly the applicants support but are all being proposed for mixed use.

And I'm going to talk a little bit about mixed use as it applies generally to what the County's doing in sort of the external areas including out toward the fairgrounds, but also specifically

and specifically here. The County's mixed use ordinance again requires a high intensity development. The development standards within demand residential densities of 12 to 40 acres or 40 units per acre and also that a minimum of 30 percent of that project be commercial. When you look at the parcels that are out here and the parcelization of the areas that are being proposed for mixed use, Pat, do you happen to have the -- I talked to you about the board for the Proposal Number 6, the most recent proposal that has the, is that around?

LEE: The zoning?

PRINTZ: Yeah. Is it close? Great. Actually if you can just set it up there, that would be great. If you can look at the areas that are, I don't know whether the Commission can see this or not, but the areas that are being proposed for MX --

MOSS: Could you lift that up, Evan?

DUST: Yeah.

MOSS: Thanks.

PRINTZ: Sorry, I could have brought an overhead I suppose. Thanks, Evan.

DUST: How's that?

MOSS: Thanks.

PRINTZ: Turn that a little bit more, maybe, a tiny bit. No, other way so they can see it. There. The areas that are being proposed for MX, thanks, Evan, are out here on the edge. They are pretty good chunks of property and they are highly parcelized, meaning there are many, many, many parcels within those areas. Under all of those, all of those areas are adjacent to the boundary and are adjacent to existing residential subdivisions, or most of them, or very, very nearby. What this will require, development under the new MX code will require that each of these parcels as they come in for development are going to have to figure out some way to do a little bit of commercial and high-density residential. There won't be any connectivity to them particularly and the need for commercial in the areas, in most of these areas, is very, very little, at least on that site-specific basis. 119th corridor will have commercial in it, the Gramor piece that we talked about will be a significant piece of commercial, and I think there are some other commercial that's being proposed for 119th. You've also got the 117th corridor and there are places that they can access very quickly. But to try and require each of these parcels as they come in to develop to try to do commercial where there's no transportation capacity in the local streets there for that, it seems very odd.

The County's comp plan requires in order to ask for a commercial designation requires a

variety of things, not the least of which is the creation of a market study to demonstrate the need for additional commercial. Now that requirement currently isn't contained in the MX code, but it is certainly analogous. And if the County's comp plan says that in order to do commercial uses, and we're talking about C-3 uses which are the uses that the MX code is going to include, that we want you to demonstrate that there is adequate need and demand in that parcel-specific area for those services, then it doesn't seem to me to make a lot of sense to have the same uses allowed. And in fact forcing the same uses to be there without any market study whatsoever or any demonstration that there is some need. So I think it clearly makes sense that these areas are coming into the UGA, but to require that each of those projects as they come in to do some kind of commercial component does not make a great deal of sense.

Mr. Hatch testified a moment ago about his parcel, actually he testified about the holding area, but this is I-5/179th Street, north leg of Delfel Road and he is right here, this is in that big area up here of MX. This particular piece I think there is logic in having some high-density residential in that area and adjacent to the freeway, that's a logical place that we tend to put higher intensive, higher density residential is next to arterials and major transportation corridors, but again to require all of these parcels that are out here to do some form of commercial development within them doesn't seem to make a great deal of sense. On this particular piece, when we talked to staff originally the owner was interested in commercial and staff said, well, there's a lot of commercial along 179th which is right down here and all of 179th is zoned basically for commercial development, or a good portion of it, from the freeway all the way out to the fire and police complex and there really wouldn't be the demand for those commercial services and we agree with that, but then we've got all of this mixed use that then requires commercial. Out to the other end of the county --

DELEISSEGUES: Excuse me a second. What was the request for the zoning on that last one?

PRINTZ: Oh, I'm sorry, urban medium. Some form of urban medium seem to make sense.

BARCA: That's the Hatch property?

PRINTZ: It is the Hatch property. This piece is already within the UGA and it is currently zoned residential, as is the piece right here. The edge of the urban growth boundary is right here. This is Ward Road, this is 88th Street, this is 162nd, the Padden comes in right here, this area is all zoned commercial and Gramor is in the process of beginning development plans for that. They've asked that this piece also be zoned commercial so that it can be developed in conjunction with this. This is the largest commercial node in the Sifton area north of Fourth Plain that serves all of this residential out here, plus all of the traffic from Hockinson. There is a market study in the record that demonstrates the need for this additional commercial. When we approached staff with this piece originally the concern

was that you're going to leave this one remaining residential piece and it's going to end up having to share some sort of access with the commercial piece. And that's a legitimate concern. As part of the development of the other piece, and we are in this is where the existing commercial is and the piece that we are seeking to have added is right here, the County staff asked us to come back to them with a circulation plan for the entire area as part of the commercial development of this site.

And Kittelson has performed that and I've actually got two alternatives, although neither of them change this, and what you see from this is that the commercial development would end up being here and oriented this way, this new arterial or new collector would access that other, that single piece, that remainder piece. And it would not only access it to the east, but it would end up being oriented toward the east and it seems to make sense that this would end up being a good transition between the commercial to the east oriented residential and then to the rural. So we would ask that that this one 5-acre piece be zoned -- or 4 acres be zoned commercial C-3 consistent with what is already here. What you saw up there that transportation plan had the local access going through here and this was the arterial. Those are the parcels that are already in that are requesting a slightly different designation.

And then I've got a couple that are not in that we'd like to have in. This is the McCune piece. And UR Bliss Road is down here, Fred Meyer and all those sorts of things, the 139th corridor, all of that is right in here, this is right at the edge of the UGA. This piece has a variety of things going for it. Number one, this subdivision that was done below it was required to actually stub a street to this for future development. It has sewer and water not only stubbed to it but on it. It's a 4-acre piece, it's flat, it doesn't have any critical areas and it would seem to meet in Spades all of the criteria that GMA sets forth for adding land to the urban growth boundary, which is that it is easily accessible all urban services.

DELEISSEGUES: So on that one they want urban low density; is that --

PRINTZ: Correct. This piece is out in Mount Vista. All of Mount Vista is right here. This is another piece that has -- the UGA, by the way, comes down and it is adjacent to the existing urban growth boundary on two sides. It is also relatively flat, no critical areas that I am aware of. It has sewer and water stubbed to the site. It has transportation capacity at 179th corridor, substantial capacity up there right now and due to many of the improvements that have been done to that interchange. And again, this piece simply fits --

MOSS: Randy, excuse me, I've got to catch up. I was catching my notes up on the last one.

PRINTZ: That's okay, sorry.

MOSS: Can you tell me what the cross street is here again?

PRINTZ: Yeah, this is 137th, this is 179th up here, this is all Mount Vista in here, 134th is way down here.

MOSS: Okay, thank you.

PRINTZ: And that takes care of sort of the parcel-specifics. I've got a couple of very brief comments that I would like to make. One is --

LEIN: Randy, was that again low density?

PRINTZ: Yeah, urban low density.

MOSS: What was that parcel size?

PRINTZ: It's 40 acres. So I'm trying to help your time frame so. How's the court reporter doing? One of the things that has surfaced in the last month or two is the idea that all of the land that would be brought into the UGA would come in under some -- under this new holding designation. And I got from staff the language of the proposal and it essentially requires that any land that the County would bring in either has to be annexed, which will be quite interesting for the fairgrounds area and actually most of the stuff along 119th. That does make sense probably for the Camas and Vancouver corridor, but annexation for those areas is either politically impossible or a very, very long way off, which leaves you with the second alternative which is if annexation is not geographically feasible, adoption of an interlocal agreement and a subarea plan to the extent possible to Clark County and the City of Vancouver that include the following: Provisions for full availability of urban services, and then it gives a list.

So you need an interlocal agreement and a subarea plan for schools. I'm curious as to how that would work because there are no such interlocal agreements for any of the properties inside the UGA right now, I don't know how you would -- I don't know what an interlocal agreement would look like for schools. Originally some people tried to oppose various developments because of overcrowding in schools and this county and the Board has steadfastly maintained, as has every other jurisdiction, that it is the State's legal ability to educate its children and development pays its fair share through school impact fees. Fire and police are two others. We need an interlocal agreement and a subarea plan for fire and police. Fire and police serve those areas right now. Water, sewer and roads and drainage, well, those are all good things, I don't know what an interlocal agreement for the provision of those things is going to look like.

All of those things are part of and a necessity of the development process. When a subdivision, a site plan, comes in for development review, you either demonstrate that you have adequate transportation, sewer, water, school, fire, police capacity, stormwater and proper environmental mitigation or there is no approval. What this is doing is it is, and

there's a variety of, there's a whole other laundry list of things that I'm not going to go through that are equally impossible, what this is doing is it is creating an absolute illusion of adding land to the UGA to accommodate the 20 year growth projection that that GMA requires us to do.

I respectfully disagree with Steve Stuart. Steve Stuart's comment about, well, you really don't have to worry about that because you get to redo it again in 10 years and the market factor and if we're wrong or if we under plan, we're going to get to do it again anyway and we can figure it out or make it up then, that isn't what GMA says. GMA says that you shall plan for 20 years worth of growth in this plan and we currently aren't doing that and if this were to be adopted there is absolutely no way that you would include any additional land for urban development. The costs of going through this process and even trying to figure out what these things are would be virtually impossible. Having had the pleasure of negotiating some interlocal agreements in other development agreements on very, very much smaller projects than several thousand acres of property strewn throughout the county, this just is not, it isn't reasonable, it isn't lawful, and it should not be part of the plan.

The last comment I've got, which will be extremely quick, is this land next to Vancouver Lake that is apparently in the 11th hour being asked to be taken out. It's colored red, well, it's not red on this one. It's red on mine, but I think it's right here. I represent some folks who have owned the property for close to a hundred years. None of it is zoned agricultural. It is inside the existing UGA. It was determined to have all of the requisite items or necessities for inclusion in the UGA in 1994, which means it was easily accessible for urban services, it was necessary to facilitate the County's population, somehow between 1994 and today it became less available to urban services, to sewer and to water, which is simply not true. There aren't any critical areas on a good portion of that. My client's property which is at the south end of that is flat, they've got some cows in it right now, but it is not agricultural land. Agricultural land as defined in GMA is land which has long-term commercial significance, at which it would be extremely difficult to argue that this property did. There are simply no bases upon which to take this out of the comp plan. And with that I will sit down unless you have some questions.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Printz?

MOSS: Yes. On this one that you just mentioned, where did the request originate? Is this from staff or --

PRINTZ: It's my understanding I guess from staff is that Friends of Clark County and the Ashley Heights folks approached the Board and asked them to take it out. It's anecdotal. Ron, you're on the Board, you probably know more about this than I do.

BARCA: Yeah, I don't think that's correct.

PRINTZ: But that's -- I guess the accurate answer is I don't know.

WRISTON: You said the 11th hour though. When is it being proposed to be taken out and how just --

PRINTZ: It will be -- it's being proposed to be taken out on the July --

WRISTON: Well, how recently was it in I guess is another way to put my question?

PRINTZ: Well, it was in on July 8th.

WRISTON: To now and so --

LEIN: It's in now.

PRINTZ: It's in now. It's been in since 1994.

LEE: It's a proposal of the proposed plan.

WRISTON: Okay. It is a proposal of the proposed plan. That's what I was trying to figure out is whether all of a sudden it changed here just in like the past week or --

PRINTZ: No, it's in the proposed plan.

WRISTON: And then another question is would there, and, Pat, you may be the one to answer this, where did the urban holding, this whole concept and idea come from?

LEE: I think we're going to have a pretty lively discussion about this at one of our future meetings, but for a quick answer for tonight, actually the urban holding language that's being proposed with the exception of the Vancouver urban growth area is pretty much the same as what's in the existing comp plan and it's actually something that is supported by the Cities that believe that annexation as opposed to development in the unincorporated area is the appropriate way to develop urban areas.

WRISTON: But I mean the language exists?

LEE: The language exists. The language exists in the existing comp plan largely. Vancouver is a little bit different but --

WRISTON: But it sounds like we're applying it differently. Now we're saying or the debate is that everything that comes in now should automatically be placed urban holding, we've never applied it that way, it's always been urban holding or reserve maybe on the fringe area.

PRINTZ: The holding zones in 1994 were created for two reasons. One was, and the primary reason was, for sewer and water and some areas in '94 were far enough out that they -- that the County wanted to make sure that there was adequate sewer and water. The only other one that was out there that I'm aware of that was non-sewer and water related was at the 179th interchange and the property around it which had actually an X on it, it was called a contingency zone, and the requirement there was that certain improvements to the 179th interchange got done before property could develop. There has never been to my knowledge for the Vancouver urban area anything like the laundry list that we have here. Thank you very much.

MOSS: Yeah, just one follow-up question. Inasmuch as we now have County policy and regulations that say that you can't do land divisions without connection to sewer and to water in the urban area, which was not the case back in 1994, is there any justification for this urban holding zone? Obviously you can't develop if you can't connect.

PRINTZ: I think the County's code says either you hook up and there's some -- you can get an exception if you're, you know, 1,000 feet or 2,000 feet, whatever it is, but generally that's correct. I wouldn't oppose -- I mean if the standards are --

MOSS: Excuse me, you can get an exception for --

PRINTZ: For septic if you're inside the UGA.

MOSS: -- septic, for septic for an existing parcel, but you can't get one for a land division.

PRINTZ: Correct. That is, yeah, that is correct. I wouldn't object to a holding zone that simply required you to demonstrate that there were adequate, you know, sewer and water to the property, but that's what the development process does anyway so it really doesn't make any sense.

MOSS: Thank you.

BARCA: Randy, before you go I need a clarification. Your client's property in the Felida area, that is not designated as ag land?

PRINTZ: Correct.

BARCA: It's not, okay.

PRINTZ: It's inside the UGA and, as you know, you can't have resource lands inside the UGA. I don't think it's ag I mean.

BARCA: There's a proposal to put about 2900 acres of resource land into the UGA so.

PRINTZ: I didn't look, Ron. I mean I just haven't seen any property. I know I'm almost a hundred percent sure it's not. I am a hundred percent sure it's not because --

LEE: Randy's correct, it's within the urban growth area, it's got urban low density zoning applied to it largely.

BARCA: Okay, I just wanted that clarification. Thanks.

PRINTZ: Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: I have one other question. The last property you were describing I guess east of Vancouver Lake, can you tell us the property owner's name?

PRINTZ: It's Pevey on that one.

MOSS: What?

PRINTZ: Pevey. I can -- before next week if you want I could submit something that's got their (inaudible) property. So thank you.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Printz. Starting the second sheet already. Steve Horenstein.

LEE: Five minutes.

HORENSTEIN: How much did he use? I want the rest of it.

WRISTON: You don't want to know.

LEIN: Actually he did very well with the number he had. He used it in half.

HORENSTEIN: Right, he said he was done. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. For the record, my name is Steve Horenstein, 500 Broadway, Suite 400 in Vancouver, here with our land use planner Jo Folkerts who is the creator and manager of the maps. I'm not as coordinated as Randy, I can't talk and do the maps at the same time. We have eight, only eight, to talk about. And as you can imagine I agree with most of -- practically all of Randy's comment on some of the general issues so I won't discuss them at great length; however, we do have a couple of examples or story problems, if you will, as we go through our particular sites that will demonstrate some of the concerns with some of the -- with the urban holding and such.

Let me start with the Bowyer property which is located, now watch out I'll blind you there, Jo, is located --

WRISTON: Hey, Steve, is this part of this picture here because otherwise we need to move that?

HORNE: Yes. Yes, it is, but if you can't see we'll move it anyway.

MOSS: Just slide it back a little.

WRISTON: Move it by the screen maybe or something or --

HORENSTEIN: Well, this isn't showing up on -- it's not working.

WRISTON: Borrow Randy's.

BARCA: That's better. That will be fine.

HORENSTEIN: This one's -- who's got one I can borrow? This one's fading. Evan does right here. Thank you. How do you use it, Evan? Oh, there it is. Okay. Okay, there we go. Let's start our five minutes now. There's our site-specific, there's the site here is at the corner of 119th and 117th. You might all recognize it as the old Par Three Golf Course, been there a long long time. The proposal is to bring this property into the urban growth boundary and zone it as commercial. The County Commissioners did include it in the present alternative but only as urban reserve. There is a parcel to the east which is the dairy farm there that has certainly long-term potential as industrial, but it doesn't really make sense to include this parcel as with that. I mean it's across the major arterial, it's not connected by ownership or in any way, it has very different characteristics. Our proposal is to bring it in as C-3. It does meet the locational criteria for C-3, I mentioned it in the memo that we submitted to you.

You know, a lot of the planning that we all do has a certain amount of academic exercise to it. This site is a good example of how we should be considering the market as well. There's actually a proposed development on this site. The site is under contract from the owners, the Bowyer family, to Killian Pacific, a local long-time developer that's developed the West Coast Bank building and a number of other commercial centers in the community I'm sure you're all familiar with. This is the conceptual site plan that's been done, not to be presumptuous that you're going to recommend bringing it into the boundary, but to show you that, number one, that Killian Pacific is serious about this development and has done some work to determine that the site can fully develop out as commercial. Over here we have the conceptual rendering of what the site plan would look so you can envision replacing the golf course with this commercial center. What I would propose to you is to replace some of Mr. Printz's, who is probably gone, commercial that he would like you to not designate as commercial with this site as commercial. It's very well, we didn't talk about that ahead of time, it's just something I would suggest.

Let me say that the market is ready for it, we've determined that. We've given you some

new material tonight, a letter from Eric Hovee that talks generally about the dearth of commercial in the community and it's a location where the population will support the commercial use. It is located at a major intersection that has commercial on the other three corners, two are retail commercial and one is a church that went right behind it which is the school, the high school there, it's on a main arterial between Vancouver and North County and the UGA is right across the street from this site. It is, let's see, where are we, Jo, the UGA is right there, so we're not talking about a major expansion here.

Let me talk to you about -- give you a little story problem using this site as to why the proposal for urban holding is misapplied and in my opinion not legally defensible. This parcel is several miles from the Vancouver urban growth boundary, I'm sorry, from the city of Vancouver, it's right across the street from the Vancouver urban growth boundary. It is served by Hazel Dell sewer, it is served by PUD water, it will never be served by Vancouver for those services. And transportation improvements, of course a lot of it has been done there and the developer would be required to do quite a bit. How would we comply with the urban holding statute relative to this property because it's not close enough to Vancouver, it's not in the Vancouver service area district for water or sewer. This is a really good example of why a blanket application of urban holding is just going to, number one, keep land from developing as it's required to under the Growth Management Act available for development, and, number two, we could never develop this site under that criteria because it will never be served by the City of Vancouver. You're looking at me, Mr. Wriston, like you have a question about that?

WRISTON: No, I understand.

HORENSTEIN: So in summary we're asking for C-3 for this site for all the reasons I've stated and it would develop promptly in a corridor that is ready to go. If there are no questions on that one, I would like to go to the Crossroads site. You, again, have memos on all of these that were delivered last week. I think that's probably the additional information on the last one, is it, Jo? On the Crossroads. Okay. That's right, we did not send a memo, send you a memo last week on Crossroads. Crossroads Community Church, a very large religious facility, is located right there adjacent to commercial, adjacent to 78th Street here, close to the Padden down here, had to do a great deal of transportation improvement to receive its most recent site plan approval which doubled its sanctuary size. The Crossroads has installed a state-of-the-art recording studio and they are using it to record religious music for their facility. And it's a first class facility, expensive state-of-the-art equipment and they're getting a lot of requests from other churches and religious groups in town to use it to record religious music. It's not properly zoned for that and our proposal is to zone that portion of the site necessary for the commercial use to commercial so that they can make the studio available at low cost to other religious institutions to do the religious recording.

If I were you, I'd wonder about giving us a willy-nilly commercial zone on that site. And we don't really need that, we would be willing to enter into a development agreement or

concomitant rezone agreement to limit our commercial use to the ancillary services they provide, that little coffee shop inside and bookstore and such and the recording studio, and that should alleviate any fears that we are really just expanding the commercial development to an additional site that could be reused later for something else. So I would offer that limiting agreement to assist you in making that decision. Any questions on this site?

LEIN: Steve, is it in a particular building on-site or is it in the sanctuary?

HORENSTEIN: No, it's not in the sanctuary. It's a very large complex and it's in one of the adjacent -- it's an attached building but it's in an adjacent part. Our request, just to summarize, is for general commercial actually to highway commercial.

If there are no questions on that one, I'd like to move to the Herzog site. We've got some wires crossed here tonight. You heard that site from Mr. Printz just a few minutes ago as the Pevey site, it's actually the Herzog site. Herzog is the family name, Pevey is one of the husbands, but it is --

AUDIENCE: One of the husbands?

HORENSTEIN: It's not one lady and several husbands, it's several ladies and several husbands just for the record. At least I don't think it's -- well, we'll move on. This is the site, a little easier to see map. I believe we have agreement with staff to recommend that this property shouldn't be removed from the boundary. We've worked with primarily Bob Higbie to discuss this issue. One important thing to note is that the Salmon Creek Treatment Facility is adjacent to our client's property there and it was never -- and also is on a parcel that is now designated in the alternative to come out of the urban growth boundary. Well, obviously that's an urban service, it serves a wide area, it doesn't make a lot of sense to take the treatment plant out and I think the County agrees that, staff now agrees that the site itself should remain in the boundary.

There are a variety of stories as to how this got on the map. I heard the ones that Randy mentioned, I heard it came from the Commissioners in their process, I've heard a couple of others. We don't know exactly how it happened, but it does appear to be a misplaced proposal. Per discussions with Clark County Long-Range Planning staff it's our understanding the staff position precisely is as follows: Staff has revisited the site and had discussions with the landowner. Staff found that the property in question includes the Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant which is designed to serve urban development. The site is essentially surrounded by urban residential zoning districts. The site is adjacent to the Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant which was designed to serve the property. One must drive through urban development as well as the urban residential zoning districts to reach the property. And it's our understanding staff will suggest to the Planning Commission to consider leaving the urban growth boundary in as in relation to the property. And I would like staff, Mr. Higbie, are you here?

HIGBIE: I left about an hour ago.

HORENSTEIN: Would you nod your head, please, for the Planning Commission. There you have it folks.

LEIN: That's the first time I've ever seen him say yes.

HORENSTEIN: I know, me too. We actually had him practice it a couple of times before the hearing.

BARCA: I need a clarification.

HORENSTEIN: Yes, sir.

BARCA: In our last hearing I believe Ridgefield School District was discussed in the idea. Is this the same piece of property that was stated? It's not?

HORENSTEIN: No, that's a different piece. It's further north.

BARCA: That's further north?

HORENSTEIN: Yes.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

HORENSTEIN: I think you'll hear about that again later tonight.

BARCA: Soon.

RUPLEY: From you?

HORENSTEIN: No, not from me. Just a preview.

BARCA: The ghost of Christmas Future coming in.

HORENSTEIN: All right. Are there any questions about that? I'd like to move on to a very unique project which is the proposed rural industrial land bank at the La Center Junction. We also have memos for you on this.

BARCA: Are these things that are getting passed out or are they different than these?

RUPLEY: Steve, are the things that you're passing out different than the packet we have?

HORENSTEIN: Yes. Yes. There were a couple of sites we didn't have material on for you last week and one additional piece for the commercial site.

RUPLEY: So you're arranging those?

HORENSTEIN: Yes. In 2001 Clark County approached Representative Bill Fromhold and asked him to propose to the legislature a sort of a re-upped version of the rural industrial land bank statute. There had been one in existence for -- there are actually two statutes that were originally passed by the legislature. One was to be used for a major user that couldn't find a site suitable inside the urban growth boundary. The second one that did sunset in 1999 provided for industrial parks, true industrial parks, in rural areas. Representative Fromhold with assistance from the County spent a couple of years working on this legislature, didn't get it through the first year, but worked with the Cities and particularly the City of Vancouver, environmental interests, Sierra Club, labor, wider groups, and was ultimately successful in having the legislation passed in the second year, 2002, and it looks very similar to the legislation passed in the first round back in the 1990s. It has a further limitation on commercial development, but it is essentially the same legislation.

We have been working with County staff and the Board for some months now to propose one of two that are allowed in Clark County under this new statute and the proposal is to do our first one at the La Center Junction. And you can see there the particular parcels. The Junction itself is right about there, it turns out to the La Center Road, about two properties north of this site, so it's not right on the Junction but it is directly south. The mechanism for including one of these parcels is to for the (inaudible) counties to pass a neighboring legislation so that applicants can be held to the requirements of the statute, which I would describe as requirements that overlay the general requirements for site plan approval for industrial development. We have worked with the staff for a number of months proposing some language. They've added some language and I've given you all of that just so you can see the work we've done to date. The remaining step would be for the Board -- for us to put this language into codified form and have the Board adopt it so that they could then begin to consider using the statute.

There's been a lot of discussion about this relative to the Discovery Corridor and the Cities issues regarding use of I-5 as a development corridor. One of the requirements in the enabling legislation is that there be an inventory done so that this site could be compared to other available sites and a determination could be made that this is unique enough or useful enough that it should be included in the inventory. When we started this process we were well in advance of where we are today time-wise and it was very clear that we could use additional industrial and of course there's special uniqueness in having access to I-5 with a site like this. Now that we're in the process itself, this particular application pretty much needs to play out in the GMA plan so that the site itself is recognized as part of the inventory for its unique size and its unique characteristics. So we're before you tonight to bring you up to speed on where we are and ask for your support of inclusion of this site as

a rural industrial land bank.

The nice thing about this site one of the Commissioners at least mentioned to me was that it's true industrial, it's not mixed use, it's not like what we're doing at the Ridgefield Junction, which I'm of course very supportive of, but this is a true industrial site by the terms of the State law and the implementing ordinance that we'll adopt, it can't be used for anything but. There's a significant limitation of commercial development, it can't be more than 10 percent of the site. Of course if you had a 1,000-acre site you could have 100 acres of commercial and in order to ensure that you didn't develop large retail development such as the one we proposed earlier, the language goes further in the statute that says you can't have commercial that attracts regional customers and it must be commercial there just to serve the tenants in the industrial park. And that has its attraction in this day of mixed use and all the things that are being proposed that are variations on the theme.

And there would be two things in addition to the statutory requirements that are not insignificant that we would propose. One would be a concomitant rezone agreement or development agreement that would require this property to remain true industrial even if in the next round, for example, it comes into the La Center urban growth boundary. There's certainly a lot of talk of long-range planning for that to occur. In order to ensure that the uses originally approved under the rural industrial land bank statute at the point the property becomes urban, I think a development agreement or concomitant rezone agreement would be appropriate right up front. The other thing would be to work with La Center to propose an agreement not to oppose annexation if down the road 10, 15, 20 years it becomes available. So it could come in the city, but it would have to remain a true traditional industrial park. Giving you a lot of reading material on this, but I'm happy to answer questions at this point if you have before we move on to the next site.

BARCA: I actually have a question for staff at this particular point. The proposed acreage here is only a portion of what the proposed alternative is for the County for the industrial urban reserve. Is that this same intersection up there?

LEE: I think the property is entirely within the industrial urban reserve overlay although it has ag zoning as its primary use as an overlay in an industrial reserve.

HORENSTEIN: That's correct. It's zoned ag. There is some grandfathered nonconforming commercial use on some of the property, light commercial use, but it is 100 percent within the proposed -- of the urban reserve that was established last time.

MOSS: Steve, where's the access to this parcel? Is there frontage there along I-5?

HORENSTEIN: Yes, there's a good frontage road along -- as you come off the freeway you come around and it's right there.

MOSS: Okay, thank you. I thought that's where it was.

HORENSTEIN: It probably would have to be widened a bit but it's a good road.

MOSS: What would be the effect of this discontinuity that you've got by leaving this Ballant property out?

HORENSTEIN: We're not through talking to property owners. It could come in in the end, but we don't see -- we would see that site probably as a site for a single user, tenant user.

MOSS: Okay.

HORENSTEIN: There doesn't need to be an internal connection I don't think to all the sites.

RUPLEY: In the legislation does it say anything about something that's disconnected like that?

HORENSTEIN: No.

RUPLEY: No, okay.

LEIN: Any other questions? Just a short break for a paper change.

HORENSTEIN: Are we ready? Thank you. The next site is a site for Pacific Rock Products doing business as Rinker Materials and there are two sites that are operationally connected but need to be addressed generally. This is the existing quarry that you're all, I'm sure, familiar with. There we go. Thank you. This is the existing, let's see, Jo, I'm not, no, the quarry is up above here, yes. The quarry is the existing, the old Kiewit now Pacific Rock quarry is up in this area up here. You'll see the new Brady Road coming in right there. It's stubbed right into the site there. This is 192nd, I presume that is about to go all the way up the hill. The second site is the site here on the waterfront. That is a site that has been used for probably a hundred years for waterfront industrial activity. I'm going to pass around an old photo, I'm not even sure how old it is, but it's in the early part of the last century. You can see the heavy industrial uses with rock and logging that continues on that site to this day.

Let's start because it's there with the waterfront parcel. It is shown as business park on the proposed plan map and we have a strong objection to that for a number of reasons. It currently continues the heavy activity that's been going on that site for most of the last century. It is an isolated portion of property that historically has been utilized as heavy industrial. It's the only privately owned industrial site that has waterfront access other than probably Columbia Business Center all along the Columbia there and Pacific Rock Products controls it for the long term. It currently is used not only for the logging operation that is not Pacific Rock's, but it's used for export of materials. The jetty rock that's come

out of the Fishers Quarry up above for a long time, it will become more important in the long-term for the import of rock material as we begin to use up our local stores of gravel that needs to be mined, and we are no doubt doing that, this site will remain very important for the importing of material that the community will need for road construction and other construction purposes. Kiewit also brings in heavy equipment there so it's got a significant current use that would become immediately nonconforming if it was truly converted to business park on the proposed map. The owners and lessors of the property would have no intention of changing the use and it just doesn't make sense to make a use that's heavily used and needed for the community a nonconforming use by changing it for something for the future. Any questions on that site before I move to the Fishers Quarry up above?

The site up above is an active 100-year quarry. It has about 15 years give or take more mineral to be extracted so in that sense it's early in the game to even be talking about doing anything with this piece. It's important to know that Pacific Rock Products is currently working towards a development agreement with the City of Vancouver and it would be my client's view that unless and until we put that development agreement in place allowing the mining activity continue as required by the Growth Management Act and as is certainly necessary for not only the company but the community that it not be brought in the boundary. We have to be very clear that we can continue to mine that material. It is a great site for commercial use in the future, perhaps mixed use used in the future, you could do industrial, but I suspect it will become a very popular site for commercial use given its location at the bottom of 192nd and all that's going on up above.

I might refer you to Goal 8 of the Growth Management Act which requires natural resource industries to be protected. It says in part that natural resource industries should be maintained and enhanced as resource based industries, including productive timber, agricultural and fisheries and other industries, and encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands and discourage incompatible uses. The mining, the mineral extraction, of course is included with all of that. And this policy is further advanced by RCW 36.70A.060 where it requires the City to adopt regulations to protect among other things the mining activity. The development agreement that we are negotiating with the City would get us a long way in that direction. So, again, our request is to have it not included in the urban growth boundary as the map proposes unless we reach a satisfactory agreement with the City. Or to put it another way, you could condition it coming in the boundary on the parties entering into agreement sufficient to protect the mining activity. Are there any questions on that?

BARCA: And that's because it's designated as resource land today?

HORENSTEIN: It is as a practical matter resource lands today, yeah.

BARCA: So in relationship to the 115 acres up in the La Center area, that's considered resource ag land, bringing that in in an industrial zoning, are you working out some kind of

agreement to keep that as ag land until it's appropriate to change that over?

HORENSTEIN: That land is not used for ag, it's used actually for some commercial and residential purposes at the La Center Junction, it's got an ag zone but an urban reserve designation which means we're moving it towards urban use, there is no mining to occur there, there's not no farming to protect there, it's just got a zone but it isn't actually resource land.

BARCA: It's designated as resource land?

HORENSTEIN: Designated as ag land with an urban reserve overlay, which assumes that it will be for urban development, very different than this site.

I'd like to take the next two in order. Jo, put up Rosemary Parker site first if you would. We're now talking about property in the area of between 119th and 99th east of 117th, much like the area that Randy was talking to you about. This is 119th. The two sites we're talking about are this site and this site. The prior sites are down here and then this site. The alternative map shows that this site is included in the proposed map along with the rest of this here. This part is actually -- this site here and this site here are actually proposed as part of an (inaudible) of land to do a large residential development. And unfortunately for all the folks involved it is shown as business park on the proposed new map. And what we would ask you to consider is replacing that business park designation with residential designation for this and the other areas that you'll hear from James Howsley about.

Let me step aside for a second and talk about the assumptions and the concerns, the various opinions on the assumptions as they show on the map and as we're using them and you're considering them going forward. I was involved, as Randy was, along with the Friends of Clark County and others in the initial steering committee that set the assumptions, and then I served for two and a half, three years it seems like on the Vancouver Plan Oversight Committee and again worked on assumptions there and had taken a very close look at it. It's my view that the assumptions you should pay attention to are the ones that have been submitted to you by James Howsley as prepared by Olson Engineering. Without repeating all of the things you heard from Randy and others, it's my view that those are the only full set of assumptions that are defensible, that accurately reflect what's on the ground, that accurately reflect inventory on an apples to apples basis and does serve as the basis for among other things moving this property on -- keeping it on the map but moving it back to residential.

This is Rosemary Parker, this up here is Jim Parker, none of the development be it business park or residential has access to 119th Street without including Jim Parker's piece. If you'd put that back up for a minute. His lot is a fairly large flag parcel of sorts and is the only way to connect all of this up and down 219th, which is critical no matter how you develop this site. So our request for this site is that it come in the boundary. Our request for both the sites is that they be designated in lieu of business park or residential. And I

believe you'll hear more from Mr. Howsley about that.

And I have one additional site and that is the Waldal site which is clear up at the other end of the county in Battle Ground.

LEIN: Steve, what's the name of it?

HORENSTEIN: Waldal, W-a-l-d-a-l. You received a memo from us last week. And this is a relatively simple situation. I applaud Battle Ground's efforts to try to include both jobs and housing and commercial and do a good job of growing that community and in their view of what a balanced way is, but they've gotten a little bit over the edge in our view on this site. This is the Waldal site, it's a 40-acre site. It's adjacent to a school site here. The purple site is the school site. It's adjacent to the first phase of residential that Mr. Waldal did which is down here and it's always been his intention to extend the residential to this site and it is adjacent to some proposed mixed use here and ag to the north. If you take a step back and take a 10,000 foot look at just putting a 40-acre piece of industrial in here, not compatible with the school use, not compatible as residential with the ag use, not necessarily compatible with the mixed use and part of an overall family plan to just extend that commercial, that residential up into the adjacent, the remaining portions of his property that are adjacent here, it just doesn't make sense to make it just an isolated 40-acre industrial piece. Battle Ground has quite a bit other industrial proposed, we support that, but this site shouldn't be included in the boundary and our request that it be included in as residential.

That concludes my site-specific requests. I'm not going to repeat it again all the other things you heard about, urban holding and the assumptions, but I would again commend you to my brief argument, Mr. Printz's argument on urban holding, and the Olson information submitted by Mr. Howsley on the issue of assumptions on available land.

LEIN: Any final questions of Mr. Horenstein? Thank you.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you.

LEIN: Prior to taking a break, is Mr. Lasch still available?

AUDIENCE: He went home.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. We're going to take a break and here are the next ten names, I'd ask those of you who may have multiple presentations when I call your name could you please tell me how many presentations you have. Dan Kaler.

KALER: Just one.

LEIN: One. LeAnne.

BREMER: Four.

LEIN: Four. Brent Grening.

GRENING: One.

LEIN: Just the one?

GRENING: Just the one.

LEIN: Norm Klam.

KLAM: One.

LEIN: Mark.

FEICHTINGER: One.

LEIN: Laura Hudson.

HUDSON: I didn't want to testify again, they just made me sign in.

LEIN: Yeah, okay. Are you selling your place too? How about you, Bryan?

SNODGRASS: The same.

LEIN: Gordon Bloomquist.

BLOOMQUIST: Just one.

LEIN: Ray Haagen.

HAAGEN: One.

LEIN: Jim Wilson.

WILSON: One.

LEIN: Todd Johnson.

JOHNSON: 11. He's with mine. James and I are together.

LEIN: He's with yours. Okay. Well, that will pretty much eat up the rest of the night. Ole

Brahe-Pedersen.

BRAHE-PEDERSEN: One.

LEIN: Stan Giersdorf. Bryce Pascoe.

PASCOE: Just a sign in (inaudible).

WRISTON: That's going to be it.

LEIN: 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24. If your name wasn't called, I wouldn't anticipate hearing you tonight, okay.

AUDIENCE: So when do we get continued to?

LEIN: We will continue to next week starting at 6:30 at City Hall.

AUDIENCE: And if we can't be here because we have previous pending engagements?

LEIN: Submit your written testimony and there will probably be other opportunities to finalize any other verbal testimony.

AUDIENCE: What date?

LEIN: A week from tonight would be the 10th at Vancouver City Hall starting at 6:30.

LEE: The 9th.

LEIN: Excuse me, the 9th. I can't add. Okay.

CARTER: Are we going to get a showing of a list of names? I mean some of us have got representatives here that we're spending a lot of money on to be here and I didn't see numbers on the list as to which page is which.

LEIN: We are on Page 1, we'll get through Page 1. I have Page 2, 3, 4 and 5.

CARTER: Can you tell me, then, what page number my name is on?

LEIN: What's your name?

CARTER: The last name is Carter.

LEIN: Carter?

CARTER: And Mark Erikson.

RUPLEY: There it is right there.

LEIN: Mark Erikson is on Page 3 and you're right adjacent to him.

CARTER: When is that likely to be heard then?

LEIN: I would estimate next week. The way we went through tonight we should get through that next week.

CARTER: Thank you.

LEIN: Why don't you come up here and we'll just go through them.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: We'd like to bring the meeting back to order. Before we start we're going to limit the rest of tonight's testimony to this page and we're hoping that Mr. Howsley and Mr. Johnson are gracious enough to work through their 11 very quickly. So does everybody understand whether their name was called if they have an opportunity because I'd hate to get through at 10:00 and you're still sitting here thinking you're going to be able to have a hearing tonight. So, Mr. Kaler, please.

KALER: Daniel Kaler, 20008 NE 14th Street. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm representing not only myself but other landowners in Morning Meadows Estates. And I've also spoken to the neighboring subdivision, which is Morning Meadows Subdivision, and if you look at the back of the letter that we've signed it shows kind of a map showing both of those subdivisions.

Our concern is both of those subdivisions are almost a hundred percent developed. There's one remaining parcel in our plat and one remaining parcel between both subdivisions, I can highlight those. Where I have the laser pointed now is the remaining undeveloped parcel on our plat and there's one 3-acre parcel between Morning Meadows and Morning Meadows Estates. Our concern was with the current designation, zoning designation, of R1-6, that that really could alter the character of the neighborhood. Right now they're all one-acre parcels or greater. We've paid substantial amounts of money for these lots. We've researched it. It was previously zoned in the ag category. To the north of us is substantial wetland and floodplain area so we thought we were -- we made a really secure decision in purchasing this property. And we're really happy with the development thus far, but our concern is what could happen if the proposed zoning does in fact carry through.

What we are proposing or what we thought would be reasonable is rather than labeling

basically from Glad Tidings Church north to the wetland area, or actually to the center line of the stream, this whole area from Glad Tidings north to the stream center line is all categorized as in the R1-6 category. What we thought would be reasonable since across the street from us is Evergreen Acres, that's pretty much all acreage property, it's developed, on the north side is both of our plats which are acres or greater, why not categorize it like as in reality since if it's one acre, categorize it as one acre, or at the most like a half acre in case someone wanted to can possibly split their property. But right now most of the homes they're built, driveways are in position and very few of us could split our property if we wanted to. So our first question that we listed here was why not consider a transition, a zoning transition, going from like an acre to a half acre and (inaudible) to north, you know, quarter acre and so forth.

The second issue in the letter was looking at the lands immediately north of us. They are predominantly wetland areas and in speaking with Bob Higbie he mentioned that even though a good portion is critical, this little sliver, triangular sliver, in here say if it's 2 acres of the 10 acres that rather than conforming to the R1-6 category he could actually have a higher effective density because the critical area that he can not build on. So our concern is if it was zoned R1-6, which is 6,000-square foot lots, rather than having 7 units per acre it could be, who knows, 40, it could be a pretty dense area. So again, our main concern is zone it based upon reality. The third concern we had, I don't, I didn't zoom out far enough, but in the initial comprehensive plan behind you there it gives an example of it, there was an area designated as park lands. And I was happy with that, that is predominantly wetland area and floodplain, but now it's also tagged with that R1-6 category. So again, here was something that may have been low density, but now if in fact the zoning category carries through what's pretty much natural resource area could be abused, developed into high-density neighborhood.

The third question that we listed on our cover letter dealt with the issue of the urban growth boundary. If it is in fact necessary, which the City of Vancouver says it isn't really their interest to acquire it, why not have the urban growth boundary go up to where the natural resource area say at the edge of the wetland. If nothing else protected area versus having a developer get credit for owning critical area that he can't develop on. And I believe that covers all of the points in our letter. If you have any questions, please feel free. We did want a response. We do realize it's not necessary to have responses tonight to those questions, but we would like to have a written response to those questions.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Kaler? Thank you.

KALER: Thank you.

LEIN: Ms. Bremer.

BREMER: Thank you. Good evening. For the record my name is LeAnne Bremer, 500 East Broadway, Suite 400, Vancouver. Actually, Mr. Chair, I want to clarify, I do have four

site-specific requests to talk about, but I also wanted to address the Port of Ridgefield's request that will I believe follows me, and I would like to present some testimony following Mr. Grening's testimony if that's --

LEIN: Fine.

BREMER: The first site-specific request that I want to discuss is a proposal by Pioneer Estates, LLC. They're the group that's doing the Union Ridge development out at the Ridgefield Junction, I-5 Junction. We're currently in the master planning process with the City of Ridgefield. The Union Ridge property is roughly, I'm having the same problems Steve did with this pen. Anyway, it's basically shown on that map, the Union Ridge property. It's about 286 acres in the city of Ridgefield. It's in an employment mixed use overlay zone that was recently adopted by the City of Ridgefield earlier this year for mixed use, industrial, commercial and some residential development. The proposal is a very slight expansion of the proposed or the current urban growth boundary for the city of Ridgefield to accommodate the proposed extension of Pioneer Street. And does somebody else have a pen? This is the I-5 Junction, this is Pioneer Street, the current road system out there you go this way and this away along 5th Street, here's the new Dollar Tree Distribution Center, the proposal is to extend Pioneer Street this way down here and through the site to 10th Avenue. And the colored portions are the portions that are in the unincorporated area of Clark County outside the urban growth boundary and outside the city of Ridgefield city limits. The UGA and the city limits are the same in this area. So we're proposing to just slightly expand a little over 3 acres of the urban growth boundary to make sure that entire urban street is within the urban growth boundary for a variety of reasons.

And you may recall this proposal. Last year we came before you to add the alignment to the arterial atlas and that was eventually adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. A couple of the concerns we heard during that process is that this is just a road that's going to serve the rural area and we're not sure we want it there. The other concern was the County didn't want any sort of responsibility for maintaining it. I think this proposal will take care of those concerns. This road is definitely, street is definitely needed to serve this 200 plus acre city urban development. The City of Ridgefield supports it, it's in their comprehensive plan, it's in a development agreement we entered into with the City of Ridgefield and Dollar Tree to do it. Believe me, we tried to get this alignment in within the existing city limits and urban growth boundary, but because we had to do this certain curve here and there's some wetlands and other constraints it just, this is the best we can do. And so to make sure that we're consistent, we're under consistent development standards, street designs, to make sure that to confirm that it's an urban street to serve urban development we're asking that it be included in the urban growth boundary. Any questions about that one?

LEIN: LeAnne, the parcel just to the southeast of the large triangle that does not have -- that's white, there's a small white piece.

BARCA: The right of the P.

BREMER: This one right here?

LEIN: Yeah. Why isn't that being requested?

BREMER: I think that might -- if I recall might already be owned by the City or -- let me think. I think that's, that's the case, that maybe it's already owned by the City, but I guess it would still make sense that it would be in the urban growth boundary. It might be we just missed coloring it.

LEIN: Okay. Yeah, that didn't make any sense (inaudible).

BREMER: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: I have a question on the road that runs south and to the west back to the freeway. No south of that, down further.

BREMER: South. This one?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, that one. Does that dead-end there at the freeway or connect with that frontage road?

BREMER: No. There is the frontage road here and this is just proposed, it's not there now. And in fact this part of it the road is going in or we're going in for a grading permit as we speak so this part is nearly under construction. Any other questions on that one?

The next one I want to talk about is I represent Stonehill, LLC. This is the properties right here. To orient yourselves, this is State Highway 503 on the way to Battle Ground, this is 179th, Caples' right here, so we're looking at basically a triangular piece nestled in between the State highway and Caples and 179th on the north. The red here is the proposed Battle Ground urban growth boundary that's in the plan now and what we're proposing is to make a slight tweak to the boundary and include this property in the Battle Ground urban growth boundary. This is presently zoned Rural Commercial 1, so it already has the commercial designation. And there's several reasons why it should come into the Battle Ground urban growth boundary. As initial point, most of this property, and this is just showing current zoning and we ran out of transparencies and couldn't show you the proposed zoning, but most of this property that's coming into Battle Ground is either industrial or employment, however they're going to designate it, and residential, there's no proposed commercial in this general area. So right now this is rural commercial. According to the current comprehensive plan and the proposed comprehensive plan this doesn't meet the criteria as a rural center any longer if the boundary is in fact going to be here. And I'm going to point out why.

Under the current plan rural commercial areas or commercial centers are not intended to serve the general traveling public located between urban population centers. This is exactly what we have here. We have a major State highway, 503, between two urban population centers, Battle Ground and Vancouver, and this is the site on the way there to Battle Ground, so it doesn't meet that basic criteria of the current comp plan. And under the proposed plan, proposed policies, rural centers are defined as distinct areas of smaller lot development with a defined edge surrounded by protected rural landscape of generally open land used for agriculture, forestry, large lot residential, recreational, environmental protection purposes. Rural centers also provide a focus for the surrounding rural area. Rural commercial development should support the needs of rural residents.

If the urban growth boundary in fact goes here as it's in the proposed plan, it's the preferred alternative, then this does not meet any of those policies. And the County has already determined this site is appropriate for commercial. This isn't a big stretch to make it more intense commercial, especially when we're talking about serving an urban population where there's no proposed commercial in on this map. And including it as commercial is consistent with the locational criteria of a highway commercial zone. Again, it's ideal for serving the traveling public and we're not creating a strip development here, this is a node and so that's our proposal is to include it in the urban growth boundary and zone it highway commercial. Questions on that one?

MOSS: Just one comment, LeAnne. I'm familiar with this property and one thing that I know is that the development has already been approved on this corner --

BREMER: That's correct.

MOSS: -- and it will have to be served by septic, it can't connect to sewer, and there is sewer in the street here that it could connect to if it were in the rural, or excuse me, if it were taken into the urban growth boundary.

BREMER: That's right. It's been -- there's a preliminary site plan approval currently for the site.

MOSS: This is not, by the way, one of my projects so I have no vested interest here.

BREMER: Okay.

DELEISSEGUES: You say it is on sewer?

MOSS: There's sewer right alongside of this, but because it's rural we have County policy that says that it can't connect to sewer.

BREMER: And it just very simply doesn't meet the criteria anymore for a rural center. So if

there's not any more questions, I'll go to the next one.

And something a little different, I don't think anything you've heard tonight about rural and resource lands. This is out Washougal way, this is property approximately 80 acres. You've seen this one before, too, and I'll remind you about that. It's owned by the MacDonald Living Trust. The present urban growth boundary is right here, this red, it's about a third of a mile away, it's zoned Ag-20. It used to have a surface mining overlay on it. We finally convinced the County after two tries to lift that mining designation because we were able to prove it absolutely had no -- it was not appropriate as a mining land, and that, mining lands, and that it was most likely designated by mistake. So a couple of years ago the surface mining overlay was lifted from this site. We're proposing that this be rezoned to Rural 5 or redesignated Rural 5. The surrounding area, I don't know if this shows it too well, this is, Jo, remind me, these are Rural 5s over here, this is the ag piece, this is Rural 20, and then, again, you're getting closer to the urban area here, urban reserve, and then within the boundary.

One of the things that concerned me about the staff report that you received last week, October 2nd, was the statement in there, a couple of statements in there, that the planning process, and I'm quoting, has focused primarily on the issue of urban land supply and request a change from resource to rural densities are outside the scope of this proposed plan update, and I respectfully disagree with that statement. And you'll see that repeated in the EIS too. I don't think you can limit your plan update to just looking at urban growth or lands adjacent to proposed urban growth areas, I think the whole plan is under review under the Growth Management Act. There are specific regulations on the County's obligation to review and evaluate the comprehensive plan and that means the whole comprehensive plan. And you have to do that every five years and then look at your urban growth boundaries every ten years and in this case we've collapsed those two into one update process. So there is a requirement to look at outside urban growth boundaries and beyond this, the immediate area outside the current boundaries. So I think this is an appropriate subject for this plan update.

And there's also a number of documents that actually support my position. This is the draft comprehensive plan, this is March 2003, and I suspect there's maybe a later version either out or just about coming out based on the final EIS, but in this draft comprehensive plan is an entire chapter on rural and resource lands that there are many, many changes proposed to the policies that are in the draft plan related to rural, more to rural lands than resource lands, and to me that shows that we are looking at rural lands and policies and we should be looking at how they're being applied in the county, so it is part of this update process. Now granted these aren't radical changes that are proposed in the 20-year plan on the rural policies, but, again, they are required to be reviewed and they are in fact being reviewed.

The other thing I wanted to point out is about a year ago or so, in April, May 2001, the Clark County Board of Commissioners were asked to answer some major issues for the

comprehensive plan update, this was also presented to this body as well, and there was a number of questions that were asked. And one of the questions that was asked was what density is appropriate for rural areas, that was one of the issues that was presented to the Board to deal with in this plan update, and what ended up happening is the Board accepted the staff recommendation and which was consider changes in land use in the rural area on a case-by-case basis when within the framework of comprehensive plan policies and zoning regulations. So we have this Board direction saying, yeah, we'll look at these on a case-by-case basis and that's why I'm here tonight with this particular piece.

One other thing that's a little troubling, and I could be confused on it, maybe staff could explain, but in the most recent monitoring report in 2000 it indicates that the 1995 plan said we're going to have roughly an 80 percent, 20 percent urban/rural split and that was what the '95 plan called for. The monitoring plan in 2000 gave us percentages between 1995 and 2000 to show where has our population been going and miraculously the plan was right, it's going basically 80 percent to the urban area and roughly 20 percent to the rural area. So not only did we plan for that, but the impact has been happening, and so -- and that's fine. And then in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement the same percentages were talked about, 80 percent urban, we're going to assign 80 percent of the population to urban, 20 percent to rural. This plan talks about that. In March it says, and this is very key, it is anticipated that the rural area population will increase to approximately 92,000 people by the year 2023 which accounts for 19 percent of the total county population.

So this plan in March said we're going to expect 19 percent in the rural area. Then somewhere along the line, and I can't figure out where, when the Final Environmental Impact Statement came out, just came out, all of a sudden that dropped to 90/10, now we're planning for 90 percent to the urban area and 10 percent to the rural area, but that's not consistent with what was studied in the draft impact statement, that's not consistent with what's in the proposed plan, it's not even consistent with the Board's direction in 2001 where they were again asked should the County continue to plan for 19 percent of new growth to be in the rural areas and 81 percent in the urban areas and the Board's decision was we should as a measurement tool, they didn't want it as a hard policy that we got to make sure that at all costs that we meet that, but we're going to accept that as kind of a general guideline.

So why this is important is it seems to me that everything leading up to the final impact statement was presuming an 80/20 split and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement also talked about that there's a real scarcity of rural lands today and that there's a real need for to make sure that this is an option available for folks who move into this county. And so given the scarcity and then we're losing about 3,000 acres to the urban areas, part of the proposed plan 3,000 acres of rural lands will come into the urban growth boundary, so given the scarcity and given the loss of even more lands and then all of a sudden we're only planning for 10 percent, it seems to me that there's a real need to provide more rural lots and this is a site that's ideal for that.

And this is why. It's zoned ag now, it's never been used for agricultural activity, it doesn't have prime soils and that's one of the policy after policy in the comp plan says that we're going to look to lands that have prime soils as a way to designate ag and that's the primary criteria and this doesn't have prime soils. And it's very near urban growth boundary, there's significant parcelization around it, and it very simply doesn't have the long-term commercial significance growing capacity productivity and soil composition that's required to designate it ag. So given the fact that we need more rural lands, and this isn't a good candidate for ag land, this is -- it's appropriate to redesignate this Rural 5. Questions on that one?

And the next one I'll be very brief, is more along the same lines of the one I was just talking about. This is Mr. Frank Kanekoa, used to be Clark County Sheriff. He and his wife bought six parcels. Oh, wrong way, six parcels right here and you can barely see the parcel lines. For some strange reason even the County gave all these folks around them Rural 5 zoning, but gave them Forest 40 even though when you add up all their holdings it doesn't -- it only equals 30 acres. And then here you have much larger land holdings probably more appropriate for the forest designation. This one over here is about 60 acres. So these are six separate tax parcels they bought with hope of giving one parcel to each of their five children. They thought they were buying six parcels. We went through the County's legal lot determination process, tried to argue that they did have six parcels. Unfortunately we lost, they were found to only have two legal lots and now we're back again to try and fix what we think was really a mistake, that this given that these parcels exists, that they're surrounding other like parcels in a Rural 5 zone.

And we have, unfortunately I don't have these multiple copies but if you could just pass them down. The property's not at all suitable for forest practices, there's never been any sort of forest practice on there, there's significant slopes, 40 percent, and it's mostly deciduous trees. Do we have an aerial? And of course there's trees but certainly not a fine merchantable timber that they could and there's a lot of slopes that you'll see and it's just not appropriate, and there's the contours, it's just simply not appropriate for Forest 40, it doesn't even meet the minimum amount necessary for that zone.

MOSS: LeAnne, can you identify the ownership again and tell me where this is, I'm sorry.

BREMER: This is Mr. Frank Kanekoa and it's out there. I don't know if we have a vicinity map.

MOSS: Do you have a parcel number or anything?

BREMER: Yeah, I have --

AUDIENCE: It's submitted information on the 25th, you should have all received information last week.

MOSS: Then it's probably in this stack right here.

BREMER: It is. It is. And I couldn't even tell you the closest cross street.

LEE: Did you get the closest cross street, we could probably locate it on the map?

MOSS: I'm okay. We've got it. It's in the -- I thought this was a new one but it's in the chart here.

BREMER: Again, I just want to incorporate the arguments that I already made under the MacDonald Living Trust that there's a need for rural lands, this is a good candidate for it, they're already existing tax lots, it's consistent with the area, and I would ask that you redesignate it Rural 5. Any questions on that one?

LEIN: Any other questions of Ms. Bremer?

BREMER: And I'll be back in a minute.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Brent Grening.

GRENING: I don't know if you can all see these or not. Well, thank you. My name is Brent Grening, I am the executive director of the Port of Ridgefield. And I'm joined at the table tonight by Commissioner Roy Randel, and Tim Dawdy is with Fire District 12 out in Ridgefield. What I wanted to do tonight is very briefly show you some concepts that have been developed regarding the property. Last week when we testified we talked in general about property in the urban reserve. This is Ridgefield's urban reserve area that we'll be talking about again tonight, but right here is a piece of Port property. It's 30 acres in size. This piece here is also in the Port. It is 45 acres. So we have 75 acres here that we are interested in developing. To kind of walk you through what this part of I guess the Port's argument, right now on this, on the sort of the larger overlay, this is where Ridgefield city limits are and the urban reserve starts here and includes this 119 acres. You can sort of see the faint lines in here. This is the Port's 30 acres in here, the Seventh-Day Adventist who are next on the docket after LeAnne speaks I guess is here. So to familiarize you with that.

There is a total of roughly 175 acres here and the Port is very interested in setting a context and a tone for quality of development out in the area. We believe that Ridgefield does need the industrial lands and that one of the ways that the Port is working to create quality and livable community is to try and not only master plan its properties, but to also coordinate with its neighbors and to make sure that we integrate our development with the neighborhood. I should also mention that the County is our neighbor. This is the Tri-Mountain Golf Course starts here, I believe it's 120 plus acres, it was built by the Port so you can sort of see our history here. This was I believe built in the early '90s, later in the '90s, the Port bought this, actually auctioned this and we purchased it in 2001. This 30 acres, we recently bought this just this year. So that's -- we've had kind of a long history in

this area and we would like to see it come in and be developed and with a consistent theme.

Part of the rationale for our request is, and it's one of the reasons Mr. Dawdy is here with us tonight, is because we're very interested in saving the taxpayers money. There's a certain economy of scale that can be achieved for the public investment if we bring water and sewer to this whole site at one time. We do have a three-inch pressurized sewer main coming up here that the Port put in to serve the golf course, it would need to be improved, but that's part of what the Port does. We believe that the cost per acre is much more justified if we have a larger parcel and we can leverage other quality development by extending our public facilities into that area. We also believe that a larger site and a coordinated area will have greater marketability, greater ability to attract the types of tenants we need and want out there in terms of businesses. It gives us flexibility in the size of company that we can attract and the number of companies that we can talk to about locating here so and that's part of our justification.

I hope we suggest, we certainly meant to, that the Port, and we believe the church, very strongly as indicated in their drawing here, this is what I would call a signature building, it would anchor this corner of the industrial area or the industrial, we'll call it the industrial urban reserve, if that came in we'd have a nice anchor here. They're proposing a five state regional headquarters, 50 offices, that's high quality jobs, a very nice statement about Ridgefield, it will be a very nice neighbor for the County's facility in the golf course, it will help anchor the rest of the Port's development as well and that is why we are excited to support their proposal and I hope they're excited to support ours.

As far as jobs and economic development go, there would be approximately just about 5.2 million square feet of land there drawn, by the time we take out for infrastructure and set aside, we're looking at, let's see, about 1.2 million square feet of building would be about the maximum we could put on there if we were using a business park designation. If we look at that being developed at 3 jobs per thousand square feet, about 3700 jobs or 21 jobs per acre. If we could achieve 4 jobs per acre, or excuse me, per 1,000-square feet, we'd be at just under 5,000 jobs being created in that area. If we are successful in convincing you to designate this as within the urban growth area, we believe that it's going to enhance the ability to meet the goals and objectives of you, the Planning Commission, as Clark County to attract jobs into north county and to reverse the flow along I-5 and better use our transportation infrastructure. It's going to certainly help the Port meet its goal for economic development.

Again, we talked about the tone, we think the tone and context for development in Ridgefield is very important. This will be early in the stages of development out at the Junction. We are looking and am very interested in creating something that attracts more than a warehouse distribution type facilities out there so that's where the, you know, the Port's patient capital and public input and public support for the types of activities we do become very important. With that I'm going to close my remarks. Roy, if you had anything

to add.

RANDEL: Not really.

GRENING: If you had any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

LEIN: Any questions from members of the Commission?

BARCA: A question of staff. What is being proposed here, excuse me, what is being proposed here is different than the County alternative; is that correct?

LEE: Yes. The 30-acre parcel north of the current city limits is an industrial reserve area, it is not proposed in the proposed plan to be brought into the urban growth boundary at this time.

BARCA: So I wanted to get that clarification. And does the Port have all of the parcels that's shown on this map at this time?

GRENING: No, we do not. There are two other property owners in the area, the Langs and the Bloemke I guess is the other. We've been in conversation with them. Can I see the pointer. The Langs own this 30 acres, they are very supportive -- we talked to them yesterday, they are supportive of what the Port has planned for its property down in this area, they are very supportive of the church going here. The Bloemke family here haven't neither objected or supported our proposal, they're taking it under consideration. And, you know, we'll be in conversation with them as well. As far as we know there has been no -- there's been no opposition stated to our proposal.

BARCA: For future discussion, from at least my standpoint, should you be able to get those additional property owners to submit something in respect to this, that would be very helpful to take that under advisement that you had solidarity amongst all of the property owners.

GRENING: Mrs. Lang was here tonight and I don't know if she signed up to testify but I will ask her.

LANG: Yeah, I'm still here so verbally I'll say that I do support it.

BARCA: Did you get that in the record? Swell. Okay. The landowner to the north of the Seventh-Day Adventist, have you had any discussion about perhaps re-acquiring that golf course? I suspect that there would be no opposition to that should the Port decide to take it back.

GRENING: For a dollar.

LEIN: Don't offer, you may find it --

BARCA: I think that's on the record.

GRENING: That too.

MOSS: Which way does the dollar flow?

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you.

DAWDY: I'm Tim Dawdy, Division Chief Fire County Fire District 12, and we are the fire district that protects this area. We basically go from the fairgrounds to the Lewis River and I-5 intersects our district in half. We are interested in this property because it's the ideal place for a fire station. If you look where our fire station is now, in 1982 right about here outside of where the development is really going on we built a fire station that was a temporary station with a life span of approximately five years. We've remodeled it three different occasions. Right now it's at its full capacity and we would like to move into this area somewhere. And if you look at the map this provides us the best fire protection opportunities for the Ridgefield, La Center area. It puts us right in the middle of where we need to be and that's why the fire district supports this annexation, or actually the UGA, because it would put us in a position where we can negotiate for property and put a public safety complex in this area. So we'd like to go on record supporting this project and we would have the intention of trying to obtain property and enter into an agreement to put a fire station there.

LEIN: Thank you. Any questions? Thank you gentlemen. Ms. Bremer.

BREMER: Again for the record, my name is LeAnne Bremer, with me sitting at the table is Commissioner Hargett. Well, I have good news for you, Mr. Grening and Mr. Dawdy already said everything I was going to say. So I represent the Clark County Fire District Protection 12 and we just want to reiterate we support including that 30 acres in the urban growth boundary to give both the District and the Port flexibility in finding a site for the new fire station, that's the centerpiece of their capital facilities plan to serve new growth. And again, this is the ideal location for serving both north and south of the station, especially on the east side of I-5. And the extra 30 acres and why that's important because the Port already obviously owns property out there, but the extra 30 acres gives everybody the flexibility of finding the right site within about 75 acres and it can still accommodate industrial users and new employers that we have more to work with basically. And the station in that location would also provide needed immediate accessible fire protection services to the Port property. And with that I'll turn it over to the Commissioner and offer some final words on this.

HARGETT: Thank you. I'm Commissioner Hargett, Fire District 12, home address 25707 NE 10th Avenue in Ridgefield. I have a letter prepared by the district that I would like to

read and I believe you have a copy of it. We are asking you to include the Port of Ridgefield property that lies between NW 11th Avenue and I-5 and between Pioneer Street and NW 299th Street in the Ridgefield urban growth area. To adequately serve the projected growth coming into Ridgefield and La Center Junction the District needs to immediately address the need for a new station. While the District's present station on NE 10th Avenue is adequate to serve residential growth, it is not adequate to serve the projected commercial and industrial growth at these junctions. Present District policy requires that the District have a plan in place for a new station before they can support additional commercial and industrial growth. The District has met with the Port of Ridgefield to discuss shared facilities would meet the need of both the Port and the District. The Port has asked the private sector to submit proposals on how their present site just north of the Ridgefield Junction could be developed, including potential of a shared facilities for the Port and District.

By increasing the amount of property available for private sector use in their plans, the concept of a public facilities within this become more financially feasible. Including this property into the Ridgefield UGA will accomplish three goals for District 12. First, it will increase the possibility of a shared facility with the Port. Second, by sharing the needs of two public entities it will lower the cost to the taxpayers of both entities. Third, it will assist in providing a plan that addresses the District needs for a main station which in turn will allow job producing industry to locate at these two junctions. Our public safety facilities just west of the fairground is a prime example of five governmental agencies that have pooled resources to save taxpayers money and improve services to the community. We strongly urge that you include the above property in the growth boundary to give us a better chance of repeating this concept at the Ridgefield Junction. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions? Thank you. Norm.

KLAM: It's a real privilege for me to be able to be here this evening and I think --

BARCA: And you are?

KLAM: I'm Norman Klam. I am the Chief Financial Officer for the Seventh-Day Adventist Church at regional office here. My address is 1245 East Caples Court in La Center.

BARCA: Thank you.

KLAM: You're welcome. You know, in a way I think you're a little fortunate that I came tonight, though, because if it was one of our preachers I don't know when you'd ever leave. We would like to indicate that we are really supportive of the proposal that the Port has given to you. Our property is this property right here. We have -- we're right south of the golf course and what we've tried to do is put together a very professional type administrative/worship type of office building that would fit into the community in a positive way. Across to the north the golf course has some lovely -- it's

beautiful because of the -- I put in the water hazards, somebody told me I shouldn't say "hazard" because that probably doesn't add to beauty and it really doesn't when I play golf and my ball goes in there but that's kind of the way it is, it is beautiful when you look across the golf course. What we've tried to do is take and put together a building that would augment the golf course, we've included the water fountain in the front, and we feel that it would be a signature building to be a cornerstone to an office park.

The advantage of that to us is that we would then have the opportunity to hook in with the rest of what the Port of Ridgefield wants to do and we feel that would be advantageous to the community. Why, well, we're a permanent organization. We've been in the Portland/Vancouver area for over 100 years. With it being a regional office it would be a fairly permanent type of organization that would be on that location. The other thing is that by bringing that in there we would also assist in the community in that we would be bringing about 55 to 60 jobs that would be a part of the community at that point. Being a regional office, might interest you that we have our territory covers Alaska, Montana, Idaho, Washington and Oregon, we would have meetings that would take place there that would bring in anywhere's from 50 to 100 people many times a year and so we feel that it would be a benefit to the community to have those dollars spent in North Clark County.

We also feel that it would have an opportunity to let you know what we really are about. Let me summarize, and I don't want to take a lot of time because you guys, it's late. Really, we feel we would be a benefit to the community. Why, well, we would be a signature facility that would sit there on the corner of the property facing I-5 that would be a billboard to the community of Ridgefield, the Port and North Clark County. There would be an additional 55 to 60 jobs that would be there. Various meetings would also be an economic value to the community that we hold because there would be hotel rooms, food, et cetera, that the people would come and need to have. We would be a stable business to your organization, we would be there for a period of time.

One thing that I do need to say is that the timing of the Port's proposal would really be important to us, that's why we like the concept of you've got this area that's in the development zone now, if it could be expanded north we certainly would appreciate it. In conclusion I'd like to emphasize that as a landowner we are in full support of what the Port and the City would like to have done in that area. Hey, I want to thank you for being so attentive. Appreciate being able to be here tonight. Are there any questions?

RUPLEY: Mr. Klam, what's the average wage, salary, of these 60 jobs you're talking about?

KLAM: Probably in the neighborhood of around \$50,000.

RUPLEY: So you would consider all of them?

KLAM: Because we are a charity. Yeah. The support staff would be somewhat less.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you, sir.

KLAM: Thank you.

LEIN: Mark.

FEICHTINGER: Good evening. Mark Feichtinger. Inside this packet you're getting there's a quick four-page handout with a color diagram in it and that will just make it go very quickly. If you'll just pull out that top set there.

805 Broadway, Vancouver, Suite 725. We're here tonight to ask you to rescue this property from planning limbo and to consider moving on it now. The site is at 162nd and NE 39th Street inside the Vancouver UGA, outside the city boundaries. It's 2003-036 in your files. It's 10 acres and we're requesting C-3 community commercial. This map up here, or this aerial, which there's a yellow right in the center which shows you the 50 acres which you brought into the UGA five years ago. You brought it in as residential. You were of course all wise at that point and we're deeply appreciative of course that you did it. It has been approved in terms of 40 acres in December of 2002 for a 220 lot PUD on 40 of those acres. The County staff processed the PUD utility services platting and recording are complete this fall. There's a 10-acre tract in the lower corner, and if we could flip there to the next slide, thank you, Evan, in the lower corner which the family has reserved out for commercial purposes for your consideration. It's fully integrated into the planning of the 40 acres, common roadways, common utilities, common circulation plan.

Now the family invested in that property for commercial reasons for a couple of reasons. One, it's at a significant intersection as required by C-3. The nearest nonspecialty grocery is about two miles to the south and the nearest commercial to the north is 1.5 miles. In other words it's not strip development. The market analysis is there's exceptionally strong interest in this parcel. The family is sort of fighting off people who want to develop it for commercial purposes simply because until we work through you it won't happen. This is the last single parcel 10 acre commercial site within the Vancouver UGA, except of course the Birtcher site which is just in the process of annexation. The next slide. It's ready to go in the near term. Structural fill is in, it will be compacted and leveled by November, utilities are sized for commercial uses and stubbed. You can see all the engineering that's been predone here. All the stormwater and its treatment is integrated with the full site development and all lines are sufficient to accommodate 85 percent impermeable surfaces. Internal boundary roadways and major accesses are complete. 162nd Avenue is part of a public improvement which is coming quickly, going out for bid, and will have to be completed within three years. So, in other words, widening of 162nd adjoining this and going north will essentially be complete within your planning window. Fully integrated PUD.

And if we could, Evan, the next slide. When you look at the definition of C-3 and what we're looking for here provide regular shopping and service needs to adjacent

neighborhoods. If you recall the overhead from the first slide, there's a lot of neighborhood in this area. The nearest commercial is 18 blocks or more to the south, the nearest full service grocery is more than 30 blocks to the south, and then you have another 1.5 miles up to the north. Community commercial areas should not create a strip pattern and this one certainly doesn't. These areas are held to a high standard site plan review, it's certainly getting that, and you saw the residential piece fully integrated, fully planned, trails, the whole works, so it's certainly going to get that review. Why not now, well, there really aren't many reasons why not now. This is not moving from industrial or BP to another use. It's single-family residential if it doesn't go commercial. It's the only single parcel 10 acre commercial site within the Vancouver UGA, everything else is 8 acres or less or it's an assemblage.

Next slide. Of course if you're the size of a postage stamp when looking from 50,000 feet, the process can look kind of bizarre. You know, you can start down at the lower left there, should we put in for single site, well, why don't we, you know, wait, court decision, no annexations, so it's not possible to really work with the City of Vancouver and bring that in for a while. Then we were here in 2003, then you try to figure out how you interact with the EIS and so on to make it work for a 10-acre parcel that's already in the UGA and try to convince you that we're out to make some statement in the EIS. So it's very bewildering for these property owners to try to figure out how to do something with this property which is basically the size of a postage stamp when you're looking from the elevation you're looking at. So the reality is if you don't ask, what will happen in 2004, 2005, it's wait, wait, wait, with a site that's really on this urban corridor that's really ready for development, surrounded by neighborhoods and ready to go. We really do need your assistance to pull it in. Not pull it in but literally change its zoning.

The one last slide, Evan. The only really concern I think that was voiced by one of the staffs has been a little bit on the transportation side of 162nd. Everyone has concerns about concurrency there, but the reality was a 220 lot PUD was approved there, passed concurrency, went through a traffic study. That traffic study is included in your materials. Our client has been asked and will convey frontage along 162nd for the next project which has to kick start here very soon to complete within three years. It's community commercial, not destination commercial. It's designed to serve those areas immediately around it. It will have a lot of pass by trips, it will have a lot of alternative route analysis, this is not exactly planting a bomb in the middle of 162nd in terms of traffic. If you require each owner to really go to exhaustive traffic analysis at this point, that's a little tough but we can certainly do more if you need it. In the end we need to review this site and you're the only ones that can pull it in.

So finally, why now, this is not sprawl, it's inside the UGA, the next shopping is 20 blocks or more away, this does not divert jobs from one category to another, it creates them. The family has done a good job of trying to realize the density that you wanted which is R1-6 developed 80 percent of the site at that level. It's a ready site. It's the last single 10-acre parcel. There's intense commercial interest. It will capitalize on the public investments

you're making at 162nd. It's in your jurisdiction, you're the only one who can rescue it. So the family thanks you for your time this night. You don't have to act but of course you can. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mark?

DELEISSEGUES: So you are recommending a traffic signal on Poplar Street?

FEICHTINGER: I believe that any transportation improvements in terms of -- there is one signal that is definitely going on up at the north end of the property, when it goes commercial there clearly might be another in this area. I do not have all of that analysis, Commissioner.

DELEISSEGUES: I was just looking at your report here, the traffic signal warrants.

FEICHTINGER: You bet. There's a lot of improvements to go right in there in terms of traffic signalization. Thank you very much for your time.

LEIN: Thank you.

BARCA: I've got a question before you leave, Mark. You made mention I think at one point about specialty grocery or something of that nature and then you mentioned a different kind of grocery. Is this targeted for something other than a regular --

FEICHTINGER: No.

BARCA: -- Safeway type place?

FEICHTINGER: No. I mean everyone that's been approaching us is regular grocery and I was just pointing out that the marketing analysis in here that the people suggest that the nearest nonspecialty grocery --

BARCA: Oh, nonspecialty grocery.

FEICHTINGER: -- is, would be -- is more than 20 or 30 blocks away. So that's the point, so that would be closer.

BARCA: And how far away is this actually, then, from --

FEICHTINGER: It's one and a half miles from Fourth Plain.

BARCA: From Fourth Plain, okay. Thanks.

FEICHTINGER: Thank you. Appreciate your time. Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Gordon Bloomquist.

BLOOMQUIST: I'm Gordon Bloomquist, I own the property at 11516 NE 244th Street in Battle Ground, Tax Parcel Number or Serial Number is 227018 and 226968. The two parcels consist of approximately 94 acres. And it's these two parcels in purple, one right on top of the other right there. Also I'm here for my neighbors Dave Holland, Joel Stillman and Dave Cresap, and we are trying to tie this corner right there into the Battle Ground urban growth boundary. This property, most of it is zoned agricultural. On the approximately 250 acres there's a total of four homes. It's bare ground. It has one spring that comes in off of my property here and runs through Cresap's property for probably a quarter of a mile it does and is a tributary to the Lewis River eventually. It's spring fed. It runs a trickle right now in the summer, in the winter there's a little more because it picks up runoff off the county roads. We would like to bring this into the urban growth boundary. Right now the City has voted to bring it in. Myself, I'm at the point in my life that I would like to move on with it. I've been on that property for 30 years. I plan on retiring in the next five years and I would like to develop it or do something with it and move on with my life. This is my sole retirement. Everything I've ever had I farmed and it's been put into that property. I finally paid it off two weeks ago. And, anyhow, that's my proposal is I'd like to see if we could work with it, work with us.

There is a bluff line in there the City has taken all the way to the paved road down below the hill on that 5 acres. It's all 5-acre tracts along the river below us. The City has taken all the way to there. Myself, I would be happy if they just went to the bluff line on top of the hill. Every one of us own a piece over the hill along down towards that other development down there, but I can't see where it's feasible or possible to put another pump station down there for the amount of houses you would gain myself. I'd just like you to think and consider about it. If we don't take into the urban growth, most of this will be put into 5-acre tracts, it's going to be all on septic, there's no City water available to it PUD-wise, there's City of Battle Ground there and on the top over here. I am not familiar with codes, I don't know if the City of Battle Ground will let you use their water on a 5-acre tract subdivisions or not; otherwise, you'll be looking at septic and wells and it looks like to me it would be a lot better use of the property to annex it to the city, put it on City sewer, City water and put some -- I mean use commercial development on it, residential. We're flexible on that part, we'd just like to see if we can get it a part of the urban growth. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Bloomquist?

BLOOMQUIST: Yes.

MOSS: Just a comment.

BLOOMQUIST: Do you have any questions?

MOSS: Just a comment for the record. This is Battle Ground's area B1 that shows on our aerial photos here.

LEE: It is in the area that Battle Ground had requested for inclusion, that is correct.

LEIN: Thank you.

BLOOMQUIST: Thank you.

LEIN: Ray Haagen.

HAAGEN: The front page it has a map there with a green with an X on it -- oh, I'm sorry, I should do this. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Ray Haagen. I live at 821 NE 162nd Avenue, Vancouver, Washington 98684. I am here to talk about the same property. Please see the colored map Haagen first on the front page. I live -- that's my residence there and I have lived there for about 40 years. And let's go on here a little bit.

My property, just to describe the property a little bit, these services and utilities at the site, water, sewer, natural gas, electric power, fire hydrant, phone service, cable TV and a C-TRAN bus stop on the corner. My property has curbs and sidewalks on NE 9th Street and NE 162nd Avenue. Describing NE 162nd Avenue, 162nd Avenue has three lanes going north, three lanes going south with left-hand turn lanes, turnouts and bicycle lanes on each side with a greenway going down the center. Describing NE 9th Street, 9th Street is -- I measured it at 42 feet curb to curb, it's a thoroughfare with a painted center line. Across 162nd Avenue, if you look at the map that's where the Fisher Grange Hall is located. To the south and east of my property is a fully developed duplex subdivision. I built my home on that site about 40 years ago. In the last few years I have been approached several times to sell my property. Just to mention a few, a 7-Eleven store, fast food, gas station, restaurant and a sporting goods outfit stopped by. I think my approval, I think by approving my property -- I think by approving my request there would be an increase in job opportunities and increase in property tax base. This action would bring my property to its highest and best use for many years to come.

The main reason for requesting this change is change in circumstances. Traffic counts above 25,000 a day and 10 years ago it was like 10,000 cars per day. Extension of 9th Street has brought a wave of truck traffic from the gravel pits. Planned extension for 9th Street, and I just discovered what was going on with Section 30 just about four days ago so I added it in here, I think it will probably be I'd say 10 years before anybody does anything with it. By living in the area and knowing what, a little bit of what's going on over there, but I did add a map that I had come across of that Section 30. If you'd open up to that -- and I put in three pages there, it looks like it's going to be probably in the I'd say 10 years by the way 162nd and 164th has developed since I've lived there.

Just to go on with what I've been reading to you, 162nd Avenue, 162nd changed from a

30-foot road to a six-lane highway. Now not to go into conclusion, if you just turn to the next page, I know that some of the facts I have read and request are outdated. Will updated facts be considered? At planning there must be many things on a day-to-day basis that I have no way of knowing; therefore, I am limited to how to present the representation of the facts of my property in its entirety. I remember when Mill Plain was called a road. Circumstances have changed it into a boulevard. I remember when 164th and 162nd Avenue was called Fisher Road, circumstances have changed it to 162nd/164th corridor. Circumstances have changed my property also. And then I went on to say a little bit about Section 30.

In closing, the first 30 years living on my homesite was good times, and my wife kind of brought this up, about the last 10 years circumstances have changed the good times. And in conclusion, my property as designated for single-family residential may have been okay years ago, but because of its strategic corner location in the center of all the growth and changes around it on a super busy 162nd Avenue it should be rezoned to commercial, a use that is the most compatible with the current attributes to the property. I tried to make it brief. Thank you for your time. Are there any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Haagen?

MOSS: No, but I do have a comment here. The NE 9th Street that's shown on the map here is a designated collector on the arterial atlas and it has been extended all the way through to NE 172nd Avenue.

HAAGEN: Exactly.

MOSS: The map doesn't indicate that, but it is a through road and picks up quite a bit of traffic.

LEIN: Thank you. Jim Wilson.

HAAGEN: Oh, I have one other question. Is there anything that I left out that the staff needs for further consideration --

LEIN: Mr. Lee.

HAAGEN: -- that's required by me?

LEE: No. We've encouraged him to show up and he's done an excellent job of presenting his proposal.

LEIN: Thank you.

HAAGEN: Thank you.

LEIN: Jim Wilson.

WILSON: Jim Wilson, James Wilson, 27811 NE 14th Court, Ridgefield, 98642. I'm the tail on the dog tonight. It was our impression in the neighborhood that the City of Ridgefield was going to present a fairly insignificant appearing reduction in the total amount of land that they were proposing to be included in the urban growth boundary. I know that the presentation that they made last June was not completely thorough, but the understanding I had that the Port of Ridgefield folks were actually going to be the City of Ridgefield planner and that he was going to propose all the urban growth expansion east of NE 10th to be removed from consideration when in fact there's no presentation before you tonight regarding any extension of the existing city boundaries other than the Port of Ridgefield proposal to the north. So to some extent I debated whether to leave about an hour ago because I can tell by all of your faces, and I know by mine, that this has gone plenty long enough.

As a point of information, I'm not sure whether you received petitions that have a Helen's View reference to them. Those were passed around at a meeting we had last night and there may be six or eight people who actually signed them, my name was on one, and I believe the intention was that they were going to be faxed in to your office prior to noon today, but whether or not they were -- if in fact you do see them, you'll note what I noted after I had signed it that it refers to Helen's View being included with the Walker and the Walker farm and Helen's View Phase I included in the proposed urban growth boundary expansion for the city of Ridgefield. In fact Phase I and Phase II should be noted in that petition and the petitioners -- I think all I can say with some assurance all the petitioners' signatures are actually from Phase II of Ridgefield which I'm a part of, which for your information Evan was gracious enough to agree to put that up on the screen for you. But basically there's Phase I has 6 lots in it I think and Phase II has 25 lots in it.

But the other issue that I wanted to bring to your attention, which obviously isn't coming to your attention, was the potential of removing it's about 165 acres in total of the original proposal that was made back in June. And all that property would include the Walker farm, the Roher farm and the Phase I and Phase II Helen's View subdivision. Now I'm sure you have questions but you probably don't know why to ask them.

LEIN: Mr. Wilson, I'd encourage you to -- the City of Ridgefield was actually here last week and made a presentation, they did not exclude any of that property off of there. I would suggest that you possibly get a copy of what they had so that you're assured that you're comfortable or you know how to proceed with further testimony.

WILSON: I appreciate that counsel very much. You're absolutely right. Obviously I didn't prepare any documentation for tonight because I anticipated that it would be on the screen and then I would offer rebuttal testimony if possible. So thank you much.

LEIN: Thank you.

BARCA: Hang on a second. Are you pulling up the map?

LEE: Yeah, we're putting up the area because you're right, last week at least my understanding was that the City of Ridgefield did not propose drawing back that boundary as he is suggesting. They did say as a contingency maybe we'd be willing to put it into urban reserve, but they were still proposing to extend it in, to include it in the urban growth boundary if I'm remembering correctly. So you want to point out the Helen's View there, Evan.

DUST: Yeah. For the record, Evan Dust, Long-Range Planning. The Helen's View cluster subdivision.

WILSON: That's Phase II.

DUST: That's Phase II. Is this Phase I?

LEE: That's Phase I, yeah.

DUST: The area that Ridgefield talked about during staff presentation last week was generally termed the Boschma proposal and the proposal was for that to come into the boundary as part of the urban boundary of Ridgefield if I remember correctly as probably the mixed use, the employment mixed use overlay designation.

BARCA: Industrial I believe.

DUST: Industrial?

BARCA: Yeah.

DUST: And then their official request to the County, the one that's tabulated in the staff report from County staff, indicated that they also asked for additional industrial reserve. During the staff presentation at the hearing last week this seemed a little bit maybe a fall back position was if Planning Commission wasn't interested in recommending the Boschma addition, that they would take that as industrial reserve, which sort of leaves into question they did not call out specifically what would happen to this, the Walker proposal which is surrounding the two cluster, Phase I and Phase II of that cluster subdivision. So I would assume that if this came in as industrial reserve, why would you pursue this as industrial reserve.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Evan.

WILSON: This will come before you next week. Mr. Langsdorf represents the farmer Jim

Walker. And we had a meeting involving those parties just last night and that's why I'm here tonight, they aren't here tonight because they didn't get here at 5:00 like I did. But it will come before you next week because it was our general impression that just as Evan has described that land that was included under the public hearing action of the City of Ridgefield back in June is now in some limbo as to whether to include or exclude it. As one of the homeowners I can say that our concern is that we have connection with Mr. Walker where we can have a say in that process and our assumption is that if we are not included in the urban growth boundary, we will not have a significant input to how he wants to develop the property. He has told the neighborhood that he wishes to give 20 acres to Ridgefield School District and there's another 84 acres beyond that that as you could see it's a very C-shaped property and the anticipation is that someone might consider developing accessways right down the greenbelt between our houses and that would be a very negative situation for our land values we judge. (Inaudible).

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Thank you, sir. Mr. Howsley, do you have any representatives here, your clients?

HOWSLEY: If it would please the Planning Commission, we'd just present two tonight and ask to be first next week.

LEIN: Okay, we have two more after you, that's why I was asking. Are your clients here?

HOWSLEY: Yes, one client from Renaissance and I do have some other consultants here.

LEIN: Okay. All right. And you'll make presentation on two?

HOWSLEY: On two and then --

LEIN: Hold the others?

HOWSLEY: -- hold the others till next week.

LEIN: Okay, great.

BARCA: Before we get on to that other testimony --

LEIN: Do you want to take a break here? Can we take a break? Excuse me, before we do, go ahead, Ron.

BARCA: I just wanted to ask that we get a clarification on what's going on in regard to the City's proposal versus what the County is proposing.

LEE: Yes.

BARCA: So when this does come up again we'll have a better understanding of who wants what when.

LEE: We were not a party to whatever discussions happened last night so we'll try and chase that down.

BARCA: Thank you very much.

LEIN: Let's take a five-minute break.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: Mr. Howsley.

HOWSLEY: Okay. Again, for the record, James Howsley, 601 SW Second Avenue, Suite 2100, Portland, Oregon 97204. Thank you for the Planning Commission to just let me take these two ones tonight due to the fact that I do have consultants and a client here. In front of you in the black binder you have all the Howsley site-specific requests so you're going to have to lug it around next week unfortunately to hear the other cases.

The first project I wanted to discuss is the Loyal Land request and that is site-specific request 2001-051. See if I can shoot the laser pointer where this property is. It's just above Round Lake there on to the west of Crown Road. It's directly to the east of the Camas School District property. With me here tonight is Bill Horning with Western Planning & Associates. He's here to assist me in answering any questions you may have regarding this request. The request is essentially for this property to be included within the Camas urban growth area with a single-family residential zoning of R1-6.

LEIN: Is that Camas or Washougal?

HOWSLEY: Camas.

LEIN: Camas.

HOWSLEY: Camas.

RUPLEY: It says Washougal on there.

HOWSLEY: I'll get to that in a second. In November of 2002 our office originally submitted a site-specific request to both the City of Camas and to the City of Washougal for inclusion within either one of their urban growth areas. In 2001 we filed a site-specific review pursuant to GMA requesting inclusion of the property either within the city of Camas or the city of Camas UGA or the Washougal UGA. In the site-specific review book please

find a copy of a detailed narrative as well as the GIS packet which provides further support for this property. Also in there you'll find a copy of this proposed site plan which is in front of you up here. The County's preferred alternative includes this parcel and its proposed expansion area for the city of Camas with the comprehensive plan designation of urban low residential.

As Marty Snell indicated last week, the City of Camas has supported these properties for expansion for the last several years. Our site-specific request is reflected in both the County's preferred alternative and the city of Camas' --

BARCA: Can we take this down now?

HOWSLEY: Is the laser pointer dead?

MOSS: Evan, do you have a laser pointer?

HOWSLEY: Real technical.

DUST: Wrote it right on the instructions to do that.

HOWSLEY: This is part of the parcel and this piece here and this piece here. Like I said, our site-specific request is reflected in both the County's preferred alternative and the City of Camas' proposal. We agree and support the proposed expansion and support the proposed comprehensive plan designation for single-family residential. As you can see up on the board there as well as the plan that's provided for you in the book, the plan would be for a mixed density residential development. There are nine pods within that development. Pod A in the southwest corner there would be for 7,000-square foot lots. Pods B1 through B4 would be proposed for 5,000-square foot lots. Pod C in the upper corner would be proposed for 4,000-square foot lots and Pods D1 and D2 would be 2500-square foot attached lots which would qualify as multi-family underneath the Camas code. The proposed development would meet the Camas density standards of 6 units an acre as well as satisfy the 25/75 percent multi-family to single-family requirements.

Please note that the setbacks that are on the proposed map are set to the County standards as the City as this property would come into the County first. So in the critical -- there's a stream that runs through here, there would be 150 foot setbacks there. Our wetlands consultant has identified some small wetlands there and then one here which would also have some setbacks. Like I said, first of all, the primary access point would be off of Crown Road here with an additional access with right-of-way provided by our property owners for a secondary access here on SE 20th Street. The Camas School District, like I said, owns the property directly to the west, allowing this development to come in as proposed would give them access to the eastern half of their property that seems to be cut off by a stream that runs the length of it.

As the Planning Commission is aware, the County staff has proposed an urban holding on all expansion areas until either annexation or infrastructure could accommodate the site pursuant to an interlocal agreement. My client and I are actively working with the City of Camas and have had preliminary discussions with about providing infrastructure to the site including water, sewer, any transportation needs that we would need to satisfy this. Again, we'd just ask that the Planning Commission recommend this property for inclusion pursuant to the preferred alternative and to the City of Camas' proposal. And if you have any questions of either me or Mr. Horning who designed --

RUPLEY: Last week the Camas School District was here asking for their site and I'm not sure if this is the same site they were talking about to be included in the Washougal UGA?

HOWSLEY: No. The one that they're referring to is a piece that's actually down here. It's in the Washougal UGA.

RUPLEY: So then does it have a building on it already?

HOWSLEY: No. This site here is just a vacant parcel where they were initially going to put the new high school which is located up here. The Camas School District has requested that this property as well as the Camas new high school come into the UGA.

RUPLEY: For Camas?

HOWSLEY: For Camas. I'm not sure that Milt testified to these parcels specifically.

RUPLEY: I think not because he was only talking about the other one.

HOWSLEY: But the other one that he was referring to is actually across Crown Road.

RUPLEY: Okay.

LEIN: Any other questions of Mr. Howsley or Mr. Horning?

BARCA: This is just part of what has been proposed for additional residential land in the Camas boundary expansion as I see this map. Are you aware of what the other parcels are to be designated as far as density or compatibility with this proposal?

HOWSLEY: Well, there's no other. You mean the ones just to the north there in the preferred alternative, I'm sorry?

BARCA: Yes.

HOWSLEY: I believe that they have a urban low designation on it and I'm not sure what the zoning is. I'm sure it's an urban low designation. And I think that there was some -- I

think Marty addressed that last week that he stated that those parcels weren't in the City's request, but they are reflected in the County's preferred alternative.

BARCA: Perhaps I could get a clarification of what we anticipate that coming in as then.

HORNING: At least while he's looking for that --

LEE: It looks like R1-6, 6,000-square foot lots.

HORNING: These parcels unlike some others you've heard about this evening are in fact not all fragmented by multiple ownerships and lots and so it creates a great opportunity to bring a cohesive master planned setting into the boundary.

LEIN: Bill, just formal, can you identify yourself.

HORNING: Yeah, my name is Bill Horning, I'm with Western Planning Associates for Land Planners, Landscape Architects. Our office is at 4621 SW Kelly Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97238.

LEIN: Thank you. Any other questions to the gentlemen on this particular property? Okay.

HOWSLEY: This is on site-specific review 2001-082, the Renaissance Home request. With me here is Tim Breedlove, Chief Financial Officer of Renaissance Homes. Behind me is Jimmy Bellamy of W&H Pacific who designed the proposed site plan that you see before you. And also with me is Randy Sebastian, the president of Renaissance Homes. Please again look in the notebook for a detailed narrative with additional support for this request, a copy of the GIS packet and the exhibits that you'll see before you. This property is located on the north side of 179th just west of 50th Avenue about right there. According to the GIS these properties total approximately 55.95 acres in size. They have a current comprehensive plan designation of agriculture with an urban reserve overlay.

If I may, I would like to first take a couple of seconds to introduce Renaissance Homes to the Planning Commission. You may be familiar with them as they are heavily active in Oregon, particularly in the metro area, as well as they have projects in Mill Creek, Washington and other places in Washington. They are an award winning builder who's won best home, best in show actually in the Portland Street of Dreams. They typically build houses that are \$300,000 and up.

In the draft EIS on three of the four alternatives of that proposed expansion, three of these, like I said, showed that these properties coming in as single-family residential. As I stated to you earlier tonight in my general comments, we believe that the Final Environmental Impact Statement and preferred alternative underestimates the amount of residential land needed to accommodate growth for the next 20 years. As part of the letter on the bottom I

explain that we would be making recommendations to the Planning Commission for additional areas to be considered for expansion to go forward to the Board of Commissioners based upon this. As I stated earlier, this property is in an urban reserve area and it's very near to the existing boundary and is also very close to the proposed expansion areas to the west. The existing boundary is right here, the proposed expansion area is just a few parcels to the west of this. As you can see by the proposal that we have set forth in front of you that is also in the notebook, there's proposed again a mixed density residential subdivision including lot sizes of R1-10, R1-6 and multi-family designation of R-12. There would be approximately 49 units of R1-10, 93 units of R1-6, and 34 R-12 units. And those R-12 units would primarily be single-family, single level attached units.

As the Planning Commission is aware, the Salmon Creek area has undergone a major transformation in the past couple of years. Future job growth in the area created by new development such as Legacy and new jobs that will come with the proposed expansion area will necessitate additional residential lands in this area. Specifically with Legacy, you know, a 220 bed hospital and two 30,000-square foot office buildings that's going to bring approximately 700 plus employees, a lot of them will be executive types and doctors so there is a need for this higher end product type out in the area. Renaissance would definitely qualify as executive housing. Earlier tonight and you heard a request from Randy Printz on the Hinton piece which is located here just to the south side of 179th, as well as last week you heard a request from the Battle Ground School District which had some properties in there also to the south side of 179th Street, we think that if the Planning Commission goes ahead and recommends that that small little box down there should come in to accommodate those requests, that it would be logical to for infrastructure sake just to extend the urban growth boundary, you know, one parcel deep, or essentially one parcel deep, on the other side of 179th Street; therefore, we request that the Planning Commission forward to the Board the recommendation that the Renaissance parcel be included within the proposed expansion area based upon the testimony presented earlier tonight about the need for additional land.

I'd also like to take an opportunity for Mr. Breedlove maybe to talk about the product type that would be going on this development.

BREEDLOVE: Tim Breedlove, 1678 SW Willamette Falls Drive, West Linn, Oregon 97068. We've just put together a brief depiction of how we view the opportunity for a parcel of this magnitude. The land plan or the master plan contemplates a mix of various product types. We believe that we see -- we had a market research firm out of Seattle, Real Vision, who has done a number of research assignments for us in the past. We commissioned them earlier this year to evaluate all the Clark County zip codes and they identified the zip code that encompasses this property as especially suited for as Mr. Howsley pointed out upper end housing. We envision a mixed use array of products which would include traditional single-family homes probably ranging in the 300 to \$500,000 range on the larger parcels.

Over the last two or three years we've focused a much larger part of our business on what

we call the active adult market, the baby boomer generation. We have a number of people who continue to express interest in moving to master on the main product single level. We believe a parcel of this size has the ability to support and the topography of this site has the ability to support homes of that nature. We have a successful project in Woodburn, Oregon which is actually a little bit farther from the metropolitan area than this site and one of the issues that's continually addressed there from prospective buyers is they would prefer a site closer to the metropolitan area. We've had a number of successful townhome products. We've viewed the attached product as complimentary in this site.

And I think the other thing I'd point out is we'd like to take advantage of the magnitude of this site to create open space. All of our recent developments in communities have incorporated amenities such as community pools and things of that nature. And I heard testimony earlier this evening regarding the need for that or the hope or the expectation that as development occurred that those types of amenities would be provided on a public basis and we generally offer that as part of our development process.

RUPLEY: A public pool did you say?

BREEDLOVE: No, I did not say, a private, but it addresses that need.

HOWSLEY: Again, just some other features of this site. We tried to strive to meet what was initially supposed to be in the city of Vancouver the 6 units per acre, obviously that's been changed to 8 units, but that can be, you know, made up for with apartments elsewhere in the city.

BARCA: How many acres is the proposal again?

HOWSLEY: It's about 55.95 I believe according to the GIS.

BARCA: And where would our connection be to any kind of commercial activity? Would that be back at 179th at the I-5?

HOWSLEY: Yeah. Again this thing is -- here there's a proposed expansion area for some mixed use as well as some kind of jobs producing thing that could provide some commercial to help accommodate this additional residential development.

BARCA: The project that you have in Woodburn, is that within their urban growth boundary?

BREEDLOVE: Yes, it is.

BARCA: It is.

HOWSLEY: I forgot to mention also within the notebook you'll just find some pamphlets

describing a little bit more about Renaissance Homes since they are new to Clark County community for you.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you, gentlemen.

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

LEIN: Ole Brahe-Pedersen.

BRAHE-PEDERSEN: My name is Ole Brahe-Pedersen, it's a hyphenated last name, I hope I don't have to spell it. I'm used to it being misspelled. B-r-a-h-e hyphen P-e-d-e-r-s-e-n. The first name is Ole, not the beer, O-l-e. I and my wife are here to strongly object to the expansion, the proposed expansion of La Center's proposal LC-3 to extend its urban growth area to Timmen Road. We have owned and resided on the property on the north side of NW La Center Road for 56 weeks exactly and our driveway entrance is directly opposite the head of Timmen Road. Neither we or our direct neighbors have been part of any survey or consultation regarding the subject UGA expansion and we object strongly to its adoption.

Now when we first moved down here we were made aware through the newspapers that there were hearings going on in both La Center and also in Vancouver relating to UGA expansion and we did attend some of them, so I guess as my letter would indicate we stumbled over several so-called key phrases that these planners like to use, and they kept using them, using them, such as a phrase contiguous to the city a UGA should be and of course in the case of La Center, small town ambience, oh, the UGA will retain it and the UGA expansion will encourage economic vitality and family wage jobs. I mean these are all phrases you're familiar with. So I'll look at it. Well, the expansion to Timmen Road is just as their planner Eric Eisemann said at your last meeting, an incremental expansion for La Center to reach the I-5 Junction.

Now we were told a long time ago by the president of the Enterprise Paradise Point Neighborhood Association that that was basically a dead issue, but apparently not, it's still alive. But of course La Center's initial step is up to La Center and to the Timmen Road. Well, the expansion would not be contiguous to the city. As anybody who has visited La Center recently knows, the center point of the Timmen Road expansion area is while you get it from La Center by crossing a rather long bridge or river with sensitive banks and then you travel half a mile up a hill that is 80 to 90 foot, now if you take a look at maps, and unfortunately I don't have an overhead projection, but you can see that all the area east of the, of the Timmen Road expansion area is a wetland, there's no continuity whatever and unlike cities such as Kelso which has a bridge and Kelso is on both sides it does not make sense. Now would the new area retain their small town ambience, no, it wouldn't. No. In order to -- it's primarily because of the topography and it's location. And of course it can be argued that it's only La Center that perceives that they haven't any kind of ambience, but of course in order to do -- to integrate the new area properly into the city core you need to go

point 8 miles down a hill, over the bridge and up another grade. That's point 8 miles.

Now will it add economic vitality, I don't think it would. Recently their only baker went out of business and the newly developed building, they are still trying to lease it. And the city lacks a full line grocery store and the only stores that are there are for quick, quick convenience type foods. Does it provide family wage jobs. Oh, we don't think so. We don't think so. One of the things that their planner Eric Eisemann again was very proud to identify was the fact that they had done all kinds of work with their zoning of manufactured homes. Oh, yes, they have, they've downsized so now they have room for more manufactured homes, yes. And these manufactured homes 750-square feet, I don't think that family wage type earners live in those. Perhaps some of the people who serve food at the casinos do, I don't know.

Of course we have alternate proposals and I'm certain that you have also received letters from my neighbors. I do know that Don Kerkow did not receive his, you have not received his input, apparently it was submitted at 11:00, but there are at least four, four letters of opposition in the communication packet. Our position of course is that in order to remain contiguous to the city that La Center should expand to the east, the northwest or the north.

They should attempt to optimize existing commercial land usage instead of even trying to approach a UGA. One approach would be, and it has been suggested to them before, to put a second story on their casinos and fill it with professional offices that would provide family wage jobs. Now we do understand that family wage jobs, they usually reside in areas where schools are good, well, the schools are not all that good in La Center and most of their kids are taught in portables. Well, perhaps the new Timmen Road expansion would give a new tax base, we doubt that.

Finally, we submit that we have not been involved, we have not been involved in any planning whatsoever, we have not been invited to come to any meeting, and even though we have lived in the area now for 56 weeks we have had no contact with the City of La Center. The UGA expansion that La Center is asking for is not logical in its conclusion, it's not based on sufficient salient and documented input from the residents and neighbors, it's potentially damaging to its environmental sensitive surrounding, and it's not based on any input from commercial developers as to its economic viability.

I thank you for your attention. And I especially want to thank your excellent staff for their marvelous write-ups on the Web site. They are -- I find them very courteous, very knowledgeable, and much, much better than those of King County.

LEIN: We appreciate that.

BRAHE-PEDERSEN: Thank you very much for your attention.

LEIN: Are there any questions from members of the Commission? Okay, thank you very much.

BRAHE-PEDERSEN: Thank you.

LEIN: Stan Giersdorf. No Stan? That concludes tonight's public hearing. Thank you for staying.

LEE: I hope you're glad you stayed.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

LEIN: Any comments from members of the Commission? I apologize for the lateness but it's my fault. I'll accept responsibility because I know I'll pay for it.

MOSS: You'll pay.

BARCA: I do have a comment based on the volumes of input that we've gotten, including a lot of site-specific information maps that need to be correlated with the County's proposal and matched up against the Cities proposals, I'm hoping we would have an opportunity to meet as a group and try and go through some of this information to try and at least acknowledge the fact that we all see particular places that are being asked to be considered in one aspect or another, there's some type of effect that's going to be placed on particular parcels. And my suggestion isn't necessarily that we need to do this immediately, but I do believe before we get into much deliberation it would be appropriate for us to do that.

DELEISSEGUES: Are you kind of suggesting, Ron, some sort of a workshop where we look at a broad overview of all these on a map or something so we can see how maybe they might fit together or where that they wouldn't?

BARCA: Yeah. I think as we're starting to get a picture painted for us about areas that are being affected we have conflicting requests. We have abundance of reference material from not only property owners but also from Cities that are different than County proposals and I would think it's definitely worthwhile to try and put some perspective on the different

space that we're looking at modifying. That's known as a plop when you throw something out and it's not responded to.

LEIN: I think we'll need a little time to think about that.

BARCA: Sure. And that's a very adequate answer. Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: Don't want to think about it tonight.

WRISTON: I'm sorry, Ron, did you say something?

LEIN: We did get through two sign-up sheets this evening, we have four sign-up sheets left, so my concern is how these will proceed this year.

MOSS: That concerns you.

LEIN: I will discuss this with Mr. Lee and we may see how many other places we can get during the next time.

WRISTON: I'm glad I have a Suburban because it's getting full of this stuff.

LEIN: I guess one suggestion, and I don't know if Mr. Lee would agree to this, would be two hearings in a week or just extension of that. We'll talk and see how that comes out.

LEE: We're flexible, we'll do whatever you need us to do.

MOSS: I think we need to vote on that right now.

RUPLEY: I'm going to have reduced gas mileage hauling all this stuff around.

LEE: Not in your stipend.

LEIN: Meeting's adjourned. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp

Vaughn Lein, Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed By:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

SWmin 10-02-2003